

2 1926

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
Prof. W. M. CALDER, M.A., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Chairman*.
L. WHIBLEY, M.A., *Hon. Secretary*.
Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., *Hon. Treasurer*.
J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D., F.B.A., *representing the Cambridge Philological Society*.
Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A., *With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association*.
J. BELL, M.A., *representing the Oxford Philological Society*.
Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;
Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;
Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XL

MAY, 1926

No. 2

CONTENTS

	PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	49
ΠΕΡΙ ΑΙΒΑΝΤΩΝ. I. J. C. LAWSON ..	52
NOTES ON THE <i>Philoctetes</i> . A. C. PEARSON ..	58
VERGIL AND PLAUTUS. H. J. ROSE ..	62
NOTES ON JUVENAL. A. CAMERON ..	62
The Eretrians in Corcyra. W. R. HALLIDAY ..	63
Sophocles, <i>Antigone</i> 909 ff. W. R. HALLIDAY ..	64
Another fragment of the <i>Hypsipyle</i> ? H. J. M. MILNE ..	64
Cic. <i>Ad Fam.</i> VII. 1. 1. W. GLYNN WILLIAMS ..	65

REVIEWS:

<i>Attische Vasenmalerei des rotfigurigen Stils</i> (Beazley). E. M. W. TILLYARD ..	65
<i>Demosthenes im Urteile des Alkibiades</i> (Drerup). W. RENNIE ..	66
<i>Notes critiques sur l'Histoire d'Alexandre</i> (Radet). W. W. TARN ..	68
<i>Eroda: I Mimiambi</i> (Terzaghi). A. D. KNOX ..	68
<i>Die Grenzen der hellenistischen Staaten in Kleinasien</i> (Meyer). W. H. BUCKLER ..	69
<i>The Text of Pseudo-Aristotle 'De Mundo'</i> (Lorimer). W. D. ROSS ..	70
<i>Exploration archéologique de Délos</i> . VIII. (Chamonard); <i>Délos</i> (Roussel). D. S. ROBERTSON ..	71
<i>On Ancient Greek Accentuation</i> (Postgate). E. H. STURTEVANT ..	72

REVIEWS (continued):

<i>Arctaeus</i> (Hude); <i>Galen</i> (Koch, etc.). W. H. S. JONES ..	74
Some Translations. R. G. Nisbet ..	74
The Warburg Library. J. L. Stocks ..	76
<i>The Annals of Ennius</i> (Steuart). H. WILLIAMSON ..	77
<i>Ovidi Tristium Liber II.</i> (Owen). E. H. ALTON ..	78
<i>Trade-Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire</i> (Charlesworth). D. ATKINSON ..	80
<i>The Founding of the Roman Empire</i> (Marsh). D. ATKINSON ..	81
<i>The Rise of the Princes' Jurisdiction within Rome</i> (McFayden). D. Atkinson ..	82
<i>Institutionen des Römischen Zivilprozessrechts</i> (Wenger). W. W. BUCKLAND ..	83
<i>Charistia Artis Grammatica</i> (Barwick). A. SOUTER ..	84
<i>Quotations from Classical Authors in Glossaries</i> (Mountford). A. SOUTER ..	85
SHORT REVIEWS	86-92
OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY	92
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	92
BOOKS RECEIVED	94

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price for Double Numbers, 3s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Prof. M. T. Smiley, University College, London; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 186, Woodstock Road, Oxford, and Mr. C. T. Seltman, Queens' College, Cambridge; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. S. K. Johnson, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, The University, Liverpool; Professor Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. R. W. Jackson, 16, Freemantle Square, Cotham, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. W. E. Nash-Williams, University College, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss E. L. Topham, Firth Park Secondary School, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss B. A. Leary, County School for Girls, Ashford; Mr. S. Price, 33, Walton Well Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. T. A. Sinclair, University College, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; and Mr. C. W. Baty, 40, Waterloo Road, Bedford.

THE CLASSICS AND THE PLAIN MAN

BY THE

RT. HON. STANLEY BALDWIN, M.P.

Paper cover, 6d. net

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY.

BOOKS

FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

86 CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C. 2.

RELIGION AND THE RISE OF CAPITALISM

A HISTORICAL STUDY (HOLLAND MEMORIAL LECTURES)

By R. H. TAWNEY, Reader of Economic History, University of London; sometime Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. Prefatory Note by BISHOP GORE. Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net. A Historical Study of the religion of the Reformation in its bearing on social and economic thought.

'A masterpiece of cogency and learning.'—*Nation*.

'This is a profoundly disturbing book.'—*Daily News*.

'An admirable résumé in a field comparatively little cultivated in this country.'—*Glasgow News*.

'A masterly volume.'—*Manchester Guardian*.

JOHN MURRAY, 50A, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

and
pon
onal
to
eate

ual
5s.
ings
ical
ical
fore
must

the
to
ock
the
The
reet,
Uni-
am,
stle-
ash-
eds;
T.
ege,
33,
ton,
her,
d.

NS

AD

M

of
cal

s.

fin
ye
iss
to
de
cu
de
fo
ne
ap
te
ab
Ju
or
B
T
of
A
of
th
be
m
of
m
n

fo
fr
C
u

at
in
of
w
le
a
P
in
h
a
S
in
to
a

The Classical Review

MAY, 1926

NOTES AND NEWS

READERS will note that, although the first issue of the *Classical Review* in this year was called 'Nos. 1, 2,' the present issue is No. 2. After the first issue went to press, the Classical Journals Board decided to publish six numbers in the current year, and to drop the style of double numeration which has been followed for some years. Under the new arrangement the *Review* will appear in February, May, July, September, November, December, on or about the 15th of those months. The July number will contain a few articles only, including selected papers read to Branches of the Classical Association. The Editors would take this opportunity of reminding members of the Classical Association, and especially the officials of the Branches, that the first two or three pages of each issue have always been open to short paragraphs on matters of general interest to students of the Classics. An exception will be made in future in the case of the July number.

The last few months have brought forth four memoirs of scholars, two from the Oxford and two from the Cambridge Press. Here follow remarks upon them by several hands.

'If Henry Jackson published little, at least in book form, it was not from inability to write. Besides keeping open house every evening in term, he would sit up far into the night writing letters as vivid, emphatic, and precise as his talk. Largely from these, Dr. Parry has made an admirable memoir, in which we have Jackson drawn by his own hand. The fact is, he deliberately spent himself in teaching, like Socrates, about whom (he wrote) "it is a pleasure to me to read or write or teach." Of his methods as student and as lecturer a clear picture emerges;

NO. CCCI. VOL. XL.

though more might be said of his work for Part II. of the *Tripes*—of the small classes where he took his seat on a bench while each pupil in turn read a paper from the desk; and, above all, of his marvellous *μαευστική* when one went to him alone for an hour after first reading the *Republic* or the *Ethics* from cover to cover. To correspondents seeking advice he was lavish of time and trouble, and his letters contain some valuable *résumés* of his own views on Aristotle and Plato. A few *obiter scripta* may be selected. "Aeschylus would be surprised to hear that we get grammar and sense out of his choruses," being libretti to be sung. The Aristophanic scholia: "About real difficulties they know no more than we do." The *Ethics*: "An *aperient* book, if I may use the phrase." The *Politics* "shows a Shakespearian understanding of human beings and their ways, together with a sublime good sense." Epicureanism "absorbs all the Stoicism that is valuable, and leaves room for something else." "Damn *Tripes*, the curse of the nineteenth century"; they "have done excellent work, but it would be a mistake to keep them going when they have become a hindrance." "I knew Hallam much as the cannibal knew the missionary: I examined him."

'Archer-Hind dedicated a book to Jackson *φιλοσόφῳ, φιλοκάλῳ, φιλοφίλῳ*; and his colleagues, saluting his eightieth birthday, wrote that Trinity was "happy above all that in possessing you it possesses one of the great English worthies." As such he stands recorded here.'

'Mr. Mackail's memoir of the late Master of Balliol has been written at the request of the College, and is obviously addressed to the Master's friends. Its interest could not lie in the narrative of Strachan-Davidson's comparatively

D

uneventful career. Notwithstanding, moreover, that Strachan's life was in a peculiar sense wedded to the life of the College—he would almost have liked to have denied any more intimate tie to all the “brethren” of the Senior Common Room—the memoir is perhaps a little disappointing as a contribution to the history of the College, although it satisfies curiosity as to its subject's special part therein. The debt which Balliol owed him was immense, but it was a debt due to personal influence and generous personal service and to zealous promotion of achievement along traditional lines, much more than to the originating or advocacy of new ideas. It was not in Strachan's temperament to allow experiments to be tried with Balliol. Mr. Mackail's appreciation of his subject's value as a teacher is not grudging, but has the air of being a little second-hand. The later generation of undergraduates were inclined to murmur against Bruns' *Fontes* and to thirst after economic interpretations. I remember the unfortunate consequences of an undergraduate's attempt to obtain Strachan's views upon housing conditions in Italy in the time of the Gracchi. Strachan's lectures were an admirable training in the rigorous use of historic material and an excellent corrective for vague generalisation from supposed modern analogies. The real object of such a memoir is, however, to bring the individuality of its subject before its readers, and in this Mr. Mackail has succeeded. He will enable Strachan's friends to enjoy in some measure the illusion of again entering into his intimacy, and dwelling under the spell of his courteous and singularly charming personality. The effect of the text is curiously assisted by the well-chosen photographs, which are extremely characteristic.

‘The memoir of John Cook Wilson, by Mr. Farquharson, runs a risk of missing its public, for it is prefixed to a work in two stout volumes published at a guinea and a half: *Statement and Inference, with other Philosophical Papers*. But those who seek it out will be well repaid, for they will find it a very able picture of a society and a man—a pic-

ture which must convince even those who knew not Wilson, since it is drawn by one who sees his subject's faults as well as his merits, his weaknesses as well as his power, yet can portray him with warm affection as well as high esteem. Such a portrait cannot be miniaturised in a paragraph, but must be studied in all its breadth.

‘Among scholars of sixty or more, the name of Cook Wilson will evoke memories of an old unhappy far-off thing. In the third volume of the *C.R.* “Wilson made two stinging attacks upon Archer-Hind in language provokingly magisterial in tone and suggesting, hardly covertly, literary dishonesty and pretence.” Archer-Hind's two rejoinders were short and disdainful, but successful on the issues that he chose. Wilson followed with a pamphlet, to which came no reply. It is a pity that the biographer has taken silence for a confession of defeat. “Archer-Hind, poor man” (as he is here called), might have said much, and said it well, if he had thought fit; but he had a nice taste in controversy as in other things.’

‘Though Francis Jenkinson was brought up on the classics and taught them for a while, he was not of note as a teacher or an advancer of classical knowledge; but many scholars knew him as the Cambridge University Librarian, and they will be glad to renew his acquaintance in Dr. Stewart's delightful memoir of one of the best and dearest of men.’

A correspondent writes:

‘The note recording the revived popularity of the Classical Tripos at Cambridge, which appeared in the *C.R.* for February, suggests that its readers may be interested to know what has been done in recent years for the better organisation of classical studies in some of the younger Universities. Down to 1893 they all, including London, provided courses leading to Classical Honours. But these courses were taken by a very small number of students; the three or four, for instance, that Manchester produced year by year was a fairly typical number; London had

rather more, other Universities rather less. But in Wales, when in 1893 the Colleges were delivered from the stultifying makeshift of external examinations, they adopted, in the Faculty of Arts, the Scotch system of courses in separate departments, each course being "completed" by a corresponding examination; thus candidates for a Pass Degree, who choose Latin for their main subject, take Latin courses of three grades, one in each of their three years, and complete each course by an examination in June. This arrangement, which has since been adopted by the University of Manchester, has the great advantage of making each department autonomous; the success or failure of each student in the examinations in each subject depends entirely on the work he does in that subject and is in no way affected by his performance in others; and, what is even more important, each department controls its own standards and is not assailed by demoralising pleas for indulgence to bad work because the student happens to have done well in other subjects. Experience has shown that in Greek and Latin, no less than elsewhere, this system tends steadily to raise the standard of performance required at each stage.

'But what effect had this improvement in the mechanism of examinations on the special study of classics? In Wales separate courses in Honours in Latin and Greek were at once established, as a logical corollary of the change in the Pass examinations; though candidates in either language were required to take and "complete" at least one year's course in the other. This soon attracted a much larger number of students to Latin Honours than had ever been known to attempt Honours in Classics; for in the great majority of the new schools then being founded by the score in Wales, there was no Greek. On the other hand, the number of candidates in Greek, though gaining a little from the general increase due to the establishment of the University on an independent basis, remained, and has since (I believe) remained, almost stationary. But many, if not most, of the students

who have taken Honours in Greek have been led to do so by taking Latin Honours first; and it is clear that this is *a priori* the likeliest way to secure students for Greek from the mass of the new schools where it is hardly taught at all.

'But in the Northern Universities of England the type of Honours School in which two languages are studied with equal requirements in the two had been longer established, and has not yet been altogether abandoned, though first at Manchester, and later at Liverpool, Honours began to be given for work of larger extent in a single language only. English, French, and other modern languages had thus secured their independence, save for minor accessory courses, at Manchester before the war; and the steady demand from students who as yet knew no Greek, for the M.A. course in Latin (which is in effect a course of Honours standard) showed that an Honours Course in Latin would meet a real need. But in establishing this, care was taken to insist upon a substantial modicum of Greek; candidates for Latin Honours, if they have done no Greek at entrance, must begin it forthwith, and give several hours a week to it all through their three years; and whether they begin Greek then or have begun it earlier, they must pass the general (ordinary B.A.) examination in Greek before they take their degree. This provision has largely increased the number of students taking Greek, and provides a steady supply of teachers capable of handling Latin matriculation classes (Fifth Form) in a scholarly way—a task which the cheaper kind of headmaster or headmistress had continually demanded, and demanded mostly in vain, from graduates who had taken merely a Pass Course in Latin without Greek.

'Side by side with this Latin Honours Course, Manchester (and Liverpool also) established a parallel Honours Course in Greek, with a parallel requirement of Latin up to the Pass standard; and students for Latin Honours who obtained any of the University scholarships were required to take Honours in Greek also, in a subsequent year. Since this change there have always been

students taking the Greek Honours Course, before or after that in Latin; but they have been fewer even than those who attempted the old Honours Course in Classics. Very few indeed of the students in the younger Universities can afford more than the minimum number of years needed for their B.A. degree; and those who are going to be teachers, if they have to choose between Greek and Latin as their main subject, are bound to choose Latin as being in much larger demand. Hence a certain number of students, coming from schools where they had had an opportunity of learning Greek, were discouraged from pursuing their study of Greek to an Honours standard.

'This drawback to the single-language system, though it affected only a small proportion of the students, seemed nevertheless serious. To meet it, Manchester has now established a third course, side by side with those in Latin and those in Greek, of Honours in Greek and Latin combined. This demands four years, unless the student can show at the end of his first year by passing the Preliminary Honours examination (normally taken at the end

of the second year) that his preliminary training has really fitted him for Honours work in both subjects *pari passu*. It is too early to judge of the effects of this new step, which of course involves some difficulties in the organisation of the Latin classes; but it has attracted some students from schools of the older type, without diminishing the numbers of those seeking admission to the Honours School of Latin. The quantity of Latin literature which is read for Classical Honours is, of course, considerably less (*i.e.*, by about half) than for the Honours School of Latin; but it is representative enough to enable a good student to read more widely by himself—which is, after all, the most important claim that can be made for any undergraduate course.

'Readers who are not concerned with the business of classical teaching will have turned away from these notes long before this point. But those who are set to handle any one side of these practical problems may be glad to know something of one attempt recently made to widen the ways of access to classical study in this country.'

ΠΕΡΙ ΑΛΙΒΑΝΤΩΝ.

PART I.

SOME students of Greek folklore and religion may be familiar with my research¹ into the modern Greek superstition concerning a kind of vampire, or, to use the Greek word, *vrykolakes*. By a close analysis of the beliefs and customs involved I endeavoured to remove from the superstition the Slavonic and the ecclesiastical accretions and to isolate the genuine Hellenic element, which I summarised thus: 'The human body sometimes remains incorruptible in the earth, and in this state is liable to resuscitation; persons so affected stand as it were half-way between the living and the dead, resembling the former when they walk the earth, and the latter when

they are lying quiet in their graves or, if unburied, elsewhere; during their periods of resuscitation they act as reasonable human beings, but their whole condition is pitiable, and the most humane way of treating them is to burn their bodies; disintegration being thus secured, they return no more to this world, but are numbered among the departed. Further the causes of such a condition are threefold—lack of burial, sudden death, and execration or deadly sin deserving of it.'²

Such was my conclusion reached by the process of eliminating the demonstrably foreign elements in the modern superstition; and it remained to verify that which I claimed as the Hellenic residue by the aid of classical literature.

¹ *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, pp. 361-484.

² *Ibid.*, p. 412.

In so doing, I stated that there was, so far as I knew, one story only in ancient literature which contained anything like a full account of a corporeal *revenant*. This story, related by Phlegon,¹ deals with the bodily resuscitation of a girl named Philinnion; and all the incidents of it, such as the relations of the girl with her lover Machates, the emptiness of the vault where she had been buried, the discovery of her in the guest-chamber where Machates lodged, and the final cremation of her body, are in complete accord with that which I had claimed to be an ancient Hellenic superstition. The date of this story I erroneously took to be the time of Hadrian, assuming that the narrator, who speaks in the first person, was Phlegon himself. Erwin Rohde has however shown² that Phlegon was quoting a letter written by Hipparchus to Arrhidaeus, half-brother of Alexander the Great; that the scene of the story was Amphipolis; and the date during the reign of Philip II. of Macedon.

This error was occasioned by the fact that the opening of Phlegon's story is lost; but a more serious consequence of that loss is that in the surviving part of the story no cause is assigned for Philinnion's resuscitation; we can only guess that her early death had been sudden or violent. I may perhaps add that the ancient conception of what I have called 'sudden' death would appear to have been more comprehensive than the modern conception, including all premature deaths as well as those occasioned by violence; and it might be supposed that Philinnion, who obviously died young, should be included among the *ἄωποι*, as they were called, if not among the *βραιοθάνατοι*.³ The interpretation however given to the word *ἄωποι* by Tertullian, in the phrase *animas immaturas et innuptas*,⁴ would exclude Philinnion, who apparently had

been married to Craterus, one of Alexander's generals, for some months before her death.⁵ The actual cause of her resuscitation remains therefore a matter of conjecture only.

Phlegon's story thus corroborated two points in my theory—namely that the belief in bodily resuscitation existed among the ancient Greeks, and that cremation was regarded by them as the appropriate means of treating the body of the person so affected. But in order to prove that the three causes assigned for such resuscitation—lack of burial, sudden death, and execration or deadly sin deserving of it—were in fact recognised by the ancients, I necessarily had recourse to no complete story, but to a number of hints and suggestions scattered throughout Greek literature.

Now in dealing with these three causes I found that the last-mentioned presented no difficulty. Curses imposing incorruptibility and resuscitation after death are common among the Greek peasants of to-day and in their folk-songs; and I was able to adduce from ancient literature instances of curses⁶ substantially the same in form and implying therefore the same belief. But with respect to the other two causes—lack of burial and violent death—I was constrained to admit that 'the whole trend of ancient literature in regard to both these calamities is the same, namely that they caused the return of the dead man's spirit—of his spirit only, be it noted, and not of his body.'⁷

The arguments by which I endeavoured to show that literature had in this respect deliberately modified and refined the gross popular superstition by substituting a ghostly phantom for a corporeal vampire need not here be recapitulated; evidence of the existence of the superstition in its crudest form among the ancients has now come to hand, and forms the subject of this and a following article—evidence which indeed includes a reconstructed story more sensational even than that of Philinnion.

¹ *Mirabilia*, cap. 1.

² *Rhein. Mus.*, Vol. XXXII., p. 329. For this reference and the correction of my error I am indebted to Collinson Morley, *Greek and Roman Ghost Stories*, p. 66.

³ For the association of these two words see Tertullian, *de Anima*, 57; and cf. many passages cited by Rohde, *Psyche*, p. 373; note 1.

⁴ *Op. cit.* 56 ad fin.

⁵ See Rohde in *Rhein. Mus.*, loc. cit.

⁶ *Modern Greek Folklore, etc.*, pp. 417-427.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 427.

It appears strange to me now that, with all my former research into this superstition, I failed to explore adequately one path of enquiry—enquiry into the ancient nomenclature of *revenants*. I pointed out indeed that, if the folk of ancient Greece believed in such beings, they must have called them by some name,¹ and I proceeded to prove that the word *ἀλάστωρ* in its original signification (together with certain synonyms, such as *μιάστωρ* and *προστρόπαιος*) was the exact equivalent of the modern *βρυκόλακας*—indicating, that is, primarily a resuscitated person wandering over the earth in pursuit of vengeance or indulging in other nefarious activities.² But I temporarily overlooked the fact which I had recorded earlier,³ that *vrykolakas* is not the only modern name applied to such a being. The word *vrykolakas* is mainly understood as denoting him in the actual exercise of his vampire-like proclivities, whereas there are other appellations which describe rather his mere physical condition; the word *τυμπανίτης* or *τυμπανιαῖος* for example indicates merely an incorrupt corpse which has its skin stretched tight like the parchment of a drum, and does not in itself imply the possibility of reanimation. The question which I omitted to put to myself was whether ancient Greek had an equivalent for such terms as these.

An equivalent exists: the word *ἀλίβας* (with its rarer synonym *σκελετός*) indicates a dead body which, instead of decaying, has become dry and withered and remains whole and incorrupt. Of this meaning there can be no doubt; *σκελετός* by its actual derivation, and *ἀλίβας* by the derivation most commonly attributed to it, whether rightly or wrongly,⁴ in antiquity, are proved to

denote a dead body (*νεκρός*) which is 'dried up' or 'deprived of moisture,' and no suspicion can arise that a writer who used that term could have been thinking of a ghost or spirit or phantom; *ἀλίβας* is essentially an inanimate body, and there is nothing in the word itself to suggest even that such a body can be reanimated, whereas a disembodied spirit is denoted by *ψυχή*. The whole testimony of ancient writers and of the lexicographers is united in this respect.⁵

This fact being clearly established, I may now take as my text a passage of the *Etymologicum Magnum*, where, s.v. 'Ἀλιβάντας (sic), will be found these words: τοὺς ἐν θαλάσῃ τελευτήσαντας. ἢ τοὺς ξηρούς. ἄλλοι τοὺς διὰ πενίαν ἀτάφους.

The importance of this passage lies in two things. First it removes any suspicion, such as some of the more loosely-worded interpretations of the word *ἀλίβας* might engender, that any and every *νεκρός* might be called an *ἀλίβας*. Quite clearly certain classes only of dead bodies tended to become *ἀλίβαντες*. To this indeed Plato too incidentally bears witness,⁶ for it is the mention of *ἀλίβαντες* and the like, but not of *νεκροί* in general, which he says causes every hearer to shudder. 'Ἀλίβαντες then are a class, and in some way a terrible class, of *νεκροί*. Secondly the passage gives us, in the form of alternative explanations of their name, specific information concerning their physical state and the causes of that state.

The explanation given by the words *ἢ τοὺς ξηρούς* is obviously that with which I have already dealt; such bodies, we are to understand, were in actual

which has been conjecturally restored as *ἔβησαν οἶον ἀλίβαντα* (i.e. οἱ ἀλίβαντα πίνοντες; cf. Hipponax, fr. 102 in Bergk, *Lyrici Graeci*, and Adam on Plato, *Rep.* 387c; and (2) on a purely conjectural restoration of a fragment of Sophocles, which may not even have been in iambic metre; see Pearson, *Sophocles* (Fragments), fr. 790. In the first of these passages *ἀλίβας* means 'vinegar,' in the second it is the name of a river in Hades.

⁵ E.g. Plutarch, *Quaest. Symph.* VIII. 10 ad fin. (736 A); Galen, l.c.; Eustathius, ll.cc.; *Etym. Magn.* l.c.; Hesychius, l.c.; Suidas, s.v. *Κήρ*.

⁶ Plato, *Rep.* 387 C.

¹ *Modern Greek Folklore, etc.*, p. 462.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 462-484.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 381.

⁴ E.g. by Galen, *de temperamentis*, I., cap. 3 ad fin., καλεῖσθαι γοῦν ἀλίβαντας τοὺς νεκροὺς ὡς ἀν' μηκέτι λιβάδα καὶ ὑγρότητα κερτημένους οὐδεμίαν. Cf. *Etym. Magn.*, s.v., 'Ἀλίβας; Hesych., s.v., ἀλίβαντες; Eustath. in *Hom.* 1559, 44, and 1679, 29 ff., etc. The derivation has often been rejected on the ground that the initial *a* in *ἀλίβας* is long. This assertion depends (1) on a line attributed by *Etym. Magn.*, s.v. *ἀλίβας*, to Callimachus, *ἔβησαν οἶνον ἀλίβαντα πίνοντες*,

appearance withered and dry, and their name denoted accordingly 'lack of moisture,' as explained by the *Etymologicum Magnum* immediately afterwards, s.v. ἀλίβας.¹ But the two other interpretations offered carry us further.

A sea-faring people such as the Greeks must inevitably consider drowning as one of the commoner forms of sudden death. In this passage the drowned may be taken therefore as representative of the βαιοθάνatoi in general, the reason for the selection of them being manifest: the very word under consideration ἀλιβάντας (sic) bears a wrong accent of set purpose as an index to its supposed meaning—dead and 'gone' (βάντας) 'in the sea' (άλι), as Stephanus too noted in his reference to the passage.² So then it is established by these few words that the drowned, and with them all presumably who had met a sudden or violent end, were believed in old time not merely to wander in ghostly guise, as the bulk of literary references would seem to indicate, but to have their bodies too withheld from corruption, and presumably therefore susceptible of reanimation from time to time by the wandering soul or ghost.

The same thing, according to this authority, is true of the unburied; and here again his words, I feel sure, hint at a supposed derivation; for he speaks not of the unburied in general, although the lack of burial was clearly what mattered, but of those who owing to poverty remained unburied. Why then 'owing to poverty'? Was he this time adopting a derivation from the root λιβ as employed in λίψ and λοιβή

rather than in λιβάς, and suggesting that these poor folk were unburied, or at any rate inadequately buried, because they did not leave behind them the means to provide the libations or unguents proper to a funeral? Perhaps so; but his etymological eccentricities have at least this merit, that they have preserved to us the knowledge that the unburied as well as those who met a violent death became ἀλιβάντες.

I may perhaps be pardoned some natural satisfaction in pointing out how completely this *trouaille* vindicates the arguments which I formerly employed and the conclusion which I reached in dealing with the old literary tradition that the unburied returned merely in the form of ghosts. No logical or consequent reason, I urged, was assigned by Homer, and no reason of any kind by Euripides, for the interest shown by the ghost of Patroclus or of Polydorus in the burial of its discarded body. 'Either then,' I wrote, 'there was no popular belief on the whole subject—which is incredible—or else it was such as literary propriety forbade them to follow. Now if the popular belief was that the unburied appeared as corporeal *revenants*, their eagerness for burial is intelligible; but if a ghost be substituted by literary convention for the *revenant*, a good reason for such eagerness becomes hard to find. Hence the inconsequence of Homer's reason; hence the silence of Euripides.

'But if, as now seems likely, the substitution of mere ghost for bodily *revenant* was a literary convention, it by no means follows that that convention is valueless as a guide to the popular beliefs of the time. It may represent a part of those beliefs, though not the whole. . . . Judicious selection rather than arbitrary invention was the method by which the literary tradition was established. Since then that tradition uniformly speaks of the soul's return, while discrepancies only arise in accounting for the soul's interest in the corpse, was it perhaps only in the latter respect that literary tradition parted company with popular belief? Did the spirit as well as the body of the dead play some part in the popular superstition? Did the common-folk

¹ Ἀλίβας, ὁ νεκρός, παρὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν λιβάδα μήτε θερμότητα, ὅ ἐστιν ὑγρότητα.

² Stephanus, s.v. Ἀλίβας . . . Aliter autem *Etym.* ἀλιβάντας dici ait τοὺς διὰ πενίαν ἀτάφους ἐτ τοὺς ἐν θαλάσῃ τελευτήσαντας: ap. quem etiam nota paroxytonos scribi ἀλιβάντας, quasi eis ἀλα βάντας. In the Venice edition of the *Etym. Magn.* 1549, the breathing on the first vowel is omitted, as if to facilitate further the derivation. Eustathius (1559, 50) would seem to have observed the misaccentuation of ἀλιβάντας in the *Etym. Magn.*, for he notes somewhat irrelevantly (*ad Od.* 6. 201) that the accent of ἀλίβας is thrown back on the analogy of the word ἀλίκρας, though elsewhere he does not accept the derivation which this analogy implies.

too hold that, after the separation of soul from body at death, the soul itself under certain conditions returned from its flight towards the house of Hades—returned however not to appear alone in ghostly guise, but to reanimate the dead body and raise it up as a *revenant*? Was this the popular doctrine from which literature selected, recording the soul's return, but suppressing the re-animation of the body, and thereby creating for itself the difficulty of explaining the soul's interest in the body?¹

The discovery that the bodies of the unburied, as well as of the other classes enumerated, were believed in antiquity to remain whole and incorrupt—tenements, as it were, awaiting reoccupation by the wandering ghost—settles beyond cavil the answer to those questions. What was an arguable surmise becomes now a certainty. The modern superstition concerning *βρυνκόλακες* or *τυμπανιαῖοι*, stripped of extraneous accretions, does in fact preserve essentially unchanged the superstition of the ancient world concerning *άλάστορες* and *άλίβαντες*. Only the names are changed.

Now the recognition of this strange belief as an element, and, if we may judge by its continued hold on Modern Greece, one of the strongest elements in ancient Greek religion has wide and momentous consequences. The connoisseur in comparative religion must find food for thought in the fact that that preservation of the dead body which in Egypt was deemed vital to the repose and well-being of the departed was deemed in Greece the one thing fatal to such repose; and again in the fact that that resurrection of the body to which Christians of all time have been bidden to look forward with sure and certain hope was the one possibility beyond the veil of death which excited in pagan Greeks the utmost terror. These fundamental contrasts of religious theory or psychology I leave to experts; but it needs no expert to appreciate now the better that historical scene on the Areopagus when Paul first spoke to the Athenians of him whom God 'raised from the dead,' or

to understand why, 'when they heard of the resurrection from the dead, some mocked'—at his invitation to worship what they conceived as an *άλίβας*—and why 'others said, We will hear thee again of this matter.'²

But if I provide only a new problem in comparative religion, I may claim to provide in ancient Greek literature a solution of problems; for I will venture to assert that there are certain passages of the *Oresteia*, for example, which can be fully understood only by one who is conversant with the characteristics of an *άλίβας*.

The contemporaries of Aeschylus and of the other tragedians were perfectly familiar with them. Thus Aristophanes can make a passing allusion to the 'Stone of Withering' (*τὸν Αὔαινον λίθον*), as one of the terrors of the underworld, in the full assurance that his audience will appreciate the shudders of Xanthias and the *οἶμοι κακοδαίμων* which the phrase evokes.³ It is we only who need and welcome the scholiast's note that in inventing the 'Withering-Stone' Aristophanes based himself on the fact 'that the dead wither and become *άλίβαντες*.'⁴ Yet how many readers of Aeschylus apply the knowledge thus obtained to that

*ἄνθος ἐξ Ἐρινύων,
δέσμοι φρενῶν, ἀφ' ὧν μίκτος, αὐτὰ βροτοῖς,*⁵

and realise that *αὐτὰ* here has the same implication as the *Αὔαινον λίθος* in the *Frogs*? Yet the scholiast here again knew what Aeschylus meant, for he explains *αὐτὰ* by (*ἄνθος*) *ὁ ξηραίνων τοὺς βροτοὺς*. Xanthias then feared that the 'Withering-Stone' would turn him into an *άλίβας*; and Orestes too is doomed by the binding-spell of the Furies to become an *άλίβας*. Tragedy and comedy alike could use the superstition for their own ends.

Indeed Aeschylus harps upon this belief as on an instrument of tragic fear, justifying Plato's statement that the mere thought of *άλίβαντες* makes

¹ Acts xvii. 31, 32.

² Aristoph. *Frogs*, 194 ff.

³ Schol. ad Aristoph. *Ranas* 186, *ἀπὸ τοῦ τοὺς νεκροὺς αὐαίνεσθαι καὶ ἀλίβαντας εἶναι*, repeated in similar words in the scholium on 194 (i.e. *ξηρὸν εἶναι* instead of *αὐαίνεσθαι*).

⁵ Aesch. *Eum.* 330 and 345.

¹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 432-433.

men shudder. The verbs *ισχναίνω*,¹ *κατισχναίνω*,² *μαραίνω*³ are all used in turn of the 'shrivelling' and 'parching' of Orestes at the hands of the Furies, and prepare us for the final audacity by which the curse chanted by the Furies is named *αἰονά*, the very act and process of withering. *Καὶ ζῶντά σ' ἰσχνάσας ἀπάξομαι κάτω*,⁴ cries one of them, threatening even in Orestes' lifetime so to 'wither' him that he must needs be an *ἀλίβας* after death, and using, as it chances, one of the very words which Herodotus employs in reference to the 'drying' or 'reducing' process by which a mummy was withheld from decay.⁵

But it was not only at the Furies' hands and in vengeance for Clytemnestra that Orestes was menaced with this fate. I have shown elsewhere⁶ that, when and where the vendetta has been in vogue in Greece, a son who should fail to avenge his murdered father has been held to lie under his dead father's curse as an accessory to the crime itself, and to be liable to the same penalties as the actual murderer. The dilemma therefore of Orestes was this—that whether he slew Clytemnestra or, by sparing her, failed in his duty to his dead father, there awaited him the same penalties, culminating in that of becoming an *ἀλίβας*. Clearly then it is in this sense that we must interpret the culminating sentence in Apollo's warning to Orestes,

πάντων δ' ὀτιμον κείφιλον θήσκειν χρόνῳ
κακῶς ταριχευθέντα παμφθάρτῳ μῶρῳ,⁷

and allow the word *ταριχευθέντα* to bear here, like *ισχνάσας* above, the same sense as it bears in Herodotus⁸—and indeed the only sense which it bears in all Greek literature—'preserved' and 'withheld from corruption.' I need not reiterate here the arguments by which I previously⁹ attacked any other rendering: it is surely manifest

now that *ταριχευθέντα*, no less than *ισχνάσας* and the other terms quoted, refers to the physical condition of an *ἀλίβας*. The very tense used shows how parallel in thought are the two passages. Just as the Furies threaten to suck the very life-blood from Orestes' living frame, and thus render him sere and sapless ere they hale him to the lower world, so precisely the 'leprous blains that shall leap upon his flesh, and with savage jaws eat out its erstwhile vigour,'¹⁰ will, so Apollo warns him, leave him withered and dry, physically an *ἀλίβας*, even before death comes.

May I then in the certainty that Aeschylus in one passage after another was playing upon the horror which *ἀλίβαντες* inspired, adventure one step further, and offer a correction of the existing text in this last passage? The words *παμφθάρτῳ μῶρῳ*, with which the passage ends, I formerly interpreted as providing a strong contrast with *κακῶς ταριχευθέντα*, and I accordingly rendered the whole phrase as meaning 'damned, even in the doom that wastes all, to know no corruption.' Now if the word *παμφθάρτῳ* (itself *ἀπαξ λεγόμενον*) is correct, no other meaning is possible; but first I suspect that, if Aeschylus had desired to coin an adjective meaning 'all-destroying,' his form would have been *παμφθόρος* on the analogy of *πολυφθόρος* which he actually uses; and secondly I feel that in this final phrase, the very climax of all the horrors which Orestes must face if he should fail to avenge his murdered father, the closing words should have a cumulative rather than an antithetic effect, and should reinforce rather than contrast with *ταριχευθέντα*. The true reading therefore, I believe, is *κακῶς ταριχευθέντ' ἐπ' ἀφθάρτῳ μῶρῳ*, 'horribly withered and doomed to incorruption.' On the one hand the textual error supposed is of the slightest; the mere misreading of the abbreviated form of *ἐπ'* in a manuscript which employed contractions would at once generate *παμφθάρτῳ* and cause *ταριχευθέντα* to be written in full without elision; while, on the other hand, the gain of the whole phrase in cumulative force is

¹ Aesch. *Eum.* 267.

² *Ibid.* 137-139.

³ *Ibid.* 137-139.

⁴ *Ibid.* 267.

⁵ Herod. III. 24.

⁶ *Mod. Gk. Folklore*, etc., pp. 440 ff., with special reference to Aesch. *Choeph.* 924-925, and Eurip. *Or.* 580 ff.

⁷ Aesch. *Choeph.* 287-288.

⁸ Herod. II. 86 ff.

⁹ *Mod. Gk. Folklore*, etc., pp. 421 ff.

¹⁰ Aesch. *Choeph.* 280-281.

vast; for indeed, if I were asked for a definition of an ἀλίβας, I could give none better than κακῶς ταριχευθέντ' ἐπ' ἀφθάρτων μόρφω.

The reconstructed story of an ἀλίβας, to which I referred earlier, will form the subject of a second article.

J. C. LAWSON.

NOTES ON THE PHILOCTETES.

22 f. ἃ μοι προσελθὼν σίγα σήμαιν' εἴτ' ἔχει
χωρὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν τόνδε γ' εἴτ' ἄλλη κυρεῖ.

JEFF and Masqueray accept Blaydes's τὸν αὐτόν in place of πρὸς αὐτόν, which, notwithstanding Radermacher's attempt to combine it with προσελθὼν, is generally regarded as indefensible. But the violence of the remedy should give cause for hesitation. I have proposed πρόσσυλον, which would correspond to πρόσσυκον, as πύραυλος stands beside πάροις. As to its suitability I must refer to Jebb's remark: 'Odysseus is sure that the cave is somewhere near (16). His doubt is whether Philoctetes still lives in it, or has removed to some other part of the island.'

29 f. NE τὸδ' ἐξῆπερθε, καὶ στίβου γ' οὐδεὶς τύπος.
ΟΔ ὅρα καθ' ὕπνον μὴ καταυλισθεὶς κυρῇ.

N. is climbing the rocks with a view to the discovery of the cave. In place of the vulgate τύπος L. supports κτύπος, and most modern editors follow its authority. But there is something to be said for τύπος. στίβου is track rather than footsteps, of a man's treading, that could be heard (*nomen actionis*). Wunder had anticipated Jebb's argument in favour of κτύπος, that without it v. 30 loses its special point; but, as Hermann says, it would be a strange thing for Neoptolemus to say that no sound of footsteps could be heard in order to prove that Ph. was absent. For we must consider the object which Odysseus had in view in despatching Neoptolemus to investigate. It was to find out whether Ph. was still in occupation of the cave. N. seemed to be over-hasty in drawing a conclusion when he said, after pointing to the cave above him, that there was no sign of a regular track (cf. 487 ἐρήμον οὕτω χωρὶς ἀνθρώπων στίβου). It was in answer to the unexpressed inference supposed to be in the mind of N. that Odysseus proceeds: Nevertheless he may be indoors (resting within asleep), so take care! When N. has climbed into the cave, O. concludes at

v. 40 that Ph. still occupies it and must be somewhere near. The abruptness of the dialogue is technically correct. As Neoptolemus moves from point to point the situation is continually changing, and there are intervals of silence between the successive speeches. Hence 30 does not directly answer 29.

327 f. τίνοις γὰρ ὦδε τὸν μέγαν
χόλον κατ' αὐτῶν ἐγκαλὼν ἐλήλυθας;

Radermacher, the latest German editor, defends the text as given above, but holds as against Jebb that τίνοις depends upon χόλον, quoting *inf.* 751, 1308, O.T. 698, Ai. 51, three of which passages were cited by Jebb to prove the contrary. It may be that in this latter point Radermacher was right, but the issue is not a vital one in view of the larger difficulties of the text. Cavallin finds the three following blots: (1) τὸν μέγαν for τόνδε τὸν μέγαν; (2) the phrase χόλον ἐγκαλεῖν; (3) ἐγκαλεῖν κατ' αὐτῶν. O.T. 702 λέγ' εἰ σαφῶς τὸ νεῖκος ἐγκαλὼν ἐρεῖς is insufficient to justify (2) even if that be taken alone. For I think it will be admitted that the paraphrase which Jebb is forced to adopt ['Now, on account of what have you come thus charging them with (having provoked) the great anger (which you show)?'] is a somewhat cumbrous mode of expression for 'why are you so angry with them?' There is no obvious reason for such obscurity. Observe how M. Masqueray's version avoids the difficulty: 'quelle est la cause de la grande colère dont tu es ainsi animé contre eux?' But read ἐγκαλὼν and everything falls into its place: τὸν μέγαν χόλον then follows naturally on 324 f.: 'What is the cause of the violent wrath which—now that thou art here—thou summonest up against them?' This rendering of ἐγκαλὼν follows Shakespeare's 'Stiffen the sinews, summon up the blood' in *Henry V.* (III. 1), which might be rendered συντείναντ' ἵνας, ἐγκαλεῖτ' ὀργήν

φρενῶν. For reasons which do not need to be urged in detail, ἐκκαλεῖν came to be used in this connexion chiefly in the middle voice; for the parallel use of this cf. Aesch. Ag. 270 χαρά μ' ὑφέρει δάκρυον ἐκκαλουμένη, Aeschin. 2. 3 τὴν ὑμετέραν ὀργὴν ἐκκαλέσασθαι βεβούλευται (cf. id. 1. 174). Examples of the active in Sophocles where his readers might look for the middle will be found in the Index in Vol. III. of my edition of the *Fragments*, s.v. 'active for middle.' Add Schroeder's *Prolegomena* to Pindar II. § 93, Monro on Il. 17. 742.

425. Ἀντιλοχος αὐτῷ φροῖδος δι παρὴν γόνος.

So Musgrave with the change of a single letter for *παρὴν* of the MSS. Jebb accepts this, but I do not think he has seized the full force of the expression. He attributes to it the 'general sense that the son was the stay and comfort of his father's old age.' Let me premise that αὐτῷ is governed by παρὴν: the scarcely noticeable hyperbaton is characteristic. 'He has lost Antiochus, the son who once stood at his side.' The full significance of the simple words is not realised, unless we remember the current maxim that the true son is only he whose friends and enemies are the same as his father's. Ant. 641 τούτου γὰρ οὐνεκ' ἄνδρες εὐχονται γονὰς | κατηκύουσιν φύσαντες ἐν δόμοις ἔχειν, | ὥς καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν ἀνταμύνωνται κακοῖς, | καὶ τὸν φίλον τιμῶσιν ἐξ ἴσου πατρί. Eur. fr. 84 ἡ τί πλέον εἶναι παῖδας ἀνθρώποις, πάτερ, εἰ μὴ 'πὶ τοῖς δεινοῖσιν ὠφελήσομεν; For παρῆναι as to assist cf. Eur. Or. 1159 καὶ πλησίον παρῆσθα κινδύνων ἐμοί. The legal use (= *adesse*) is well known: Dem. 21. 182, 34. 12 etc.

533-5. Ἰωμεν, ὦ παῖ, προσκύσαντε τὴν ἔσω δοικὸν εἰς οἶκον, ὥς με καὶ μάθης ἀφ' ὧν δίδων ὥς τ' ἔφην εὐκάρδιος.

It is unnecessary to repeat the *apparatus*, except to say that authority is equally balanced between εἰς οἶκον and εἰσοίκησιν. But if ever there was a *vox nihili*, εἰσοίκησις surely merits the description, notwithstanding the laboured advocacy of Jebb making the best he could of a bad case. But for the sheep-like procedure of modern editors, I should have said that Schneidewin's γῆν for τὴν in 533 (for

which see Bast, p. 710) was a certain emendation removing every trace of difficulty. Consider the following evidence: inf. 1408 στεῖχε προσκύσας χθόνα. Ar. Eq. 156 τὴν γῆν πρόσκυσον καὶ τοὺς θεοὺς (with Neil's valuable note), Aesch. Pers. 499 γαῖαν οὐρανὸν τε πρόσκυνῶν, Soph. O.C. 1654 ὀρώμεν αὐτὸν γῆν τε πρόσκυνούνθ' ἅμα καὶ . . . Ὀλυμπον. Polyb. XV. 1. 6 ὥς τοὺς θεοὺς ἀσπάσαιντο καὶ τὴν γῆν πρόσκυνήσαιεν. Ἰωμεν then goes with ἔσω εἰς οἶκον. The view of Jebb and others that it means 'let us leave Lemnos' obliges them to attach ὥς to προσκύσαντε, which is absurd: see the tell-tale dash after 'within' in Jebb's translation. As for the argument that our view involves an awkward abruptness, such is not the case. Philoctetes says, 'How can I convince you of the sincerity of my thanks? There is only one way: come in and see what I have endured.' But if Ἰωμεν means what Jebb thinks, the whole of the rest of Philoctetes' speech must be an afterthought, and Ἰωμεν is entirely isolated. If any one is inclined to prefer προσκύσοντε, observe that there would be no need to enter the cave for the purpose of performing the ritual act, which should not be postponed. But the chief object of entering the cave is given by the ὥς clause.

536. οἶμαι γὰρ οὐδ' ἂν ὁμασιν μόνῃν θέαν ἄλλον λαβόντα πλὴν ἐμοῦ τλήναι τάδε.

μόνην] μόνον Blaydes.

This is the only example in Sophocles where the adjective μόνος *adverbiascit*. On the other hand, he was partial to μόνον as an adverb, and there are eighteen instances quoted by Ellendt. Hence I think that Blaydes was right in conjecturing μόνον. The sense, of course, is 'the sight alone *without the residence* would have been enough to break another.' Jebb's note is unusually arbitrary: he quotes two examples of μόνον which serve no purpose, and does not attempt to justify μόνῃν, which he says need not be changed.

582. μὴ με διαβάλης στρατῷ
λέγονθ' & μὴ δεῖ.

The disguised merchant is alarmed in case his words should be repeated. But Jebb's translation of μὴ διαβάλης,

'don't accuse me . . .', is wrong. Camerarius (quoted by Blaydes) rightly interprets: 'ne me reddas invisum Graecorum exercitui.' See the passages quoted in Soph. *fr.* I., p. 153, and especially Eur. *Hclid.* 422 (ὅπως) πολιταῖς μὴ διαβληθῆσομαι, *I.A.* 1372 (where Iphigenia refuses to accept the self-sacrifice of Achilles in his readiness to protect her) τοῦθ' ὡρᾶν χρὴ μὴ διαβληθῆναι στρατῷ.

984 f. ἐμ', ὦ κακῶν κάκιστε καὶ τολμήσατε,
οἷδ' ἐκ βίας ἔρουν;

I accept Professor Housman's condemnation of τολμήσατε as impossible. In support of his τόλμης τέρας he has been good enough to draw my attention to Porson's correction of Damoxenus *ap.* Athen. I. 15b τέρας τι κάλλους (wrongly recorded as πέρας τι κάλλους by Kock III., p. 353, and Cobet, *N.L.*, p. 72). He adds that πέρας is also possible here in view of the passages quoted by Cobet, *N.L.*, pp. 71-2. There does not, however, appear to be any example in tragedy of either τέρας or πέρας so employed. I propose τόλμης πέρα, which was suggested by *fr.* 189, ὦ πᾶν σὺ τολμήσασα καὶ πέρα γυνή. The corruption supposed involves the change of π to τ and the subsequent confusion of comparative and superlative terminations which is illustrated by Cobet, *N.L.*, p. 119. By 'beyond boldness' I understand 'having gone to the limits of boldness and beyond it.' If it should be objected that the adverbial phrase cannot be employed as = ὁ πέρα τόλμης ὢν, as if it were ὑπέρ-τολμος, the answer is that πέρα δίκης, πέρα θανάτων, and πέρα μύθων are so found in *El.* 521, Eur. *Hec.* 715, *I.T.* 839 and 900—that is to say, co-ordinated with or standing in the place of adjectives. Add Ar. *Av.* 417 ἄπιστα καὶ πέρα κλύειν, where Blaydes gives further illustration.

1092-4. εἴτ' αἰθέρος ἄνω
πτωκάδες ὀρνέοντι διὰ πνεύματος
ἐλῶσι μ' οὐδ' ἐτ' ἰσχύς.

1092. εἴτ' Schroeder: εἰθ' codd.: ἐνθ' Radermacher.

1093. πτωκάδες uix sanum: γρ. πτωμάδες, πτωκάδες, πτωγάδες, πρωγάδες, δρωμάδες Z: fort. πτωγάδες, deas horribiles, uelut Harpyiarum ἐπίκλησις (alia in animo habuit I. H. Voss, *Myth. Epist.* I. 211).

1094. ἐλῶσι μ' B: ἐλῶσι μ' LA rec.

1092. Jebb's πέλαιαι is impossible, if for no other reason, because the synaphea requires a vowel at the commencement of this line. As regards the general sense, the notion that the timorous birds will chase Philoctetes through the upper air commends itself to M. Masqueray but to no one else. Nor can we believe that Ph. was waiting for the birds to come and destroy him. The main question is whether we are to follow the scholiast in finding a reference to the Harpies (storm-winds) sweeping Ph. off to destruction. I cannot agree with Jebb that 'obviously' this 'was merely a forlorn attempt.' The impression that it leaves upon me is rather that the scholiasts were struggling to fit a traditional explanation into the text as they found it. The problem centred in πτωκάδες, which was felt to be unintelligible—at any rate, in this connexion. The loss of the bow meant for Ph. that a situation, which hitherto was scarcely tolerable, would become hopeless. Thus he can no longer choose but yield to the whirlwinds which will carry him to destruction. For the Harpies as ministers of disappearance or death see Eustath. p. 1414, 38, Rohde, *Psyche*, I. p. 71 (quoting the tragic instances, in which he doubtfully includes this). For Homer, cf. Z 346 προφέρουσα κακὴ ἀνέμοιο θύελλα | εἰς ὄρος ἢ εἰς κύμα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης. | ν 61 ff. αἶθε . . . μ' ἀναρπάξασα θύελλα | οἴχοιτο προφέρουσα κατ' ἡρώεντα κέλευθα. | α 241 ἀκλειῶς ἄρνυται ἀνηρείψαντο.

πτωγάδες is of course only a guess. Voss, who hit on the same letters, aimed at producing something equivalent to 'herstürzende' from πτωτός—surely an impossible word. What may be said in favour of πτ. as 'dread monsters' will be found in Lobeck, *Path. El.* I. 442, Macan on Hdt. 8. 135, Pindar, *fr.* 51 (schol. Pausan. IX. 23. 6), Gruppe *Gr. Myth.*, p. 755, Roscher s.v. Ptoios, Rouse *Greek Votive offerings*, p. 11, Hesych. III. 405 Πτωγίδες· νύμφαι (referred to the nymphs indigenous to Mt. Ptoon). There was a temple of Apollo Ptdias called Ptoon, on a mount above the Copaic lake. They compare the Schreckhorn in the Bernese Oberland.

1140. ἀνδρός τοι τὸ μὲν εὖ δίκαιον εἰπεῖν.

These simple words have in their combination successfully defied interpretation, and have often been regarded as corrupt. Campbell, in my judgment, comes nearest to the truth: 'Truly, it is a man's part heedfully to assert what is right.' That is to say, he has seen that τὸ qualifies εἰπεῖν and that δίκαιον is its object. But he fails to satisfy by missing the force of δίκαιον, which has become a substantive and means a *plea*. So translate: 'it is a true man's part fairly to urge his plea.' The usage is an Atticism, and, as is natural, is found mainly in the Orators and in Euripides. In Demosthenes it occurs frequently as a *claim* without any moral connotation: e.g., 32. 24 ὡς ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀπλῶς οὐδὲν ἑώρων δίκαιον αὐτοῖς ἐνόν. But it is more to the purpose to establish it for Euripides: *I.T.* 559 ὡς εὖ (just as here) κακὸν δίκαιον εἰσεπράξατο, *I.A.* 810 τοῦμὸν μὲν οὖν δίκαιον ἐμὲ λέγειν χρεών, *Hclid.* 138 πολλὰ δ' ἤλθον . . . δίκαι' ὁμαρτῇ δρᾶν τε καὶ λέγειν ἔχων 'rights at once to enforce and to plead,' *ib.* 368 οὐκ ἄλλο δίκαιον εἰπών, *Andr.* 1162 (of Apollo) ὁ τῶν δικαίων πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις κριτής. It has often been observed that traces of Euripidean influence are to be seen in the *Philoctetes*; here we seem to have a case in point.

1149-1155: Without pretending to be able to solve the serious difficulties under which this passage labours, I think there are certain details about which agreement should be possible.

1. Jebb seems to feel no difficulty in referring αὐλίον to the lairs of the various animals, and that seems to be the natural course. It should, however, be remembered that αὐλίον is used in this play only of the cavern abode of Philoctetes, though always in the singular: cf. Hom. X 470 αὐλιν ἐσιέμεναι (of birds).

2. If πελάτ' is kept, we must follow Hermann in rendering it as *adducetis* 'you will attract.' Then πέλασσον in 1163 = 'allow to approach.'

3. We should not hesitate, if so much is allowed, to attach ἀπ' αὐλίων to φυγῆ alone. The restriction is common: see on Soph. *fr.* 771.

4. I cannot help thinking that χώρος

ἐρύκεται is an echo of Hom. K 161 ὀλίγος δ' ἐτι χώρος ἐρύκει. If so, ἐρύκεται must be middle as in M 285 κύμα δέ μιν προσπλάζον ἐρύκεται. The object (ύμᾱς) may be readily supplied. The contrasting force of ἀνέναι: ἐρύκειν, as we see it in Hom. Z 256)(ι 302, clearly points to an intentional oxymoron.

5. The punctuation of the passage with a full-stop after ὑμῖν is deplorable. The heavy stop, if employed at all, should follow τανῦν, and the run of the sentence is vastly improved if a comma is placed after ἐγὼ as after ἀλκάν previously.¹ But the chief blot is due to the failure of the critics to observe that ἀλλά introduces ἔρπετε and not ἐρύκεται. We have, in fact, an unnoticed example of the idiom ἀλλά = ἀλλὰ γάρ, to which I have drawn attention on Eur. *Phoen.* 99 ἀλλ' οὔτις ἀσπῶν τοῖσδε χρίμπτεται δόμοις | κέδρου παλαιὰν κλίμακ' ἐκπέρα ποδί.

1365: The words following συλῶντες and extending to ἔκριναν were rightly removed by Bruck. The suggestion made in the critical note to insert ὕστερον δὲ σὲ | Ὀδυσσεὺς κρίναντες in their place is due to the feeling that δ . . . συλῶντες is lacking in amplitude without some such addition. Moreover, the existence of these words in the original text would encourage interpolation by those who were familiar with the rivalry of Ajax and Odysseus and the formal decision between their claims, but knew of nothing similar in the relationship of Odysseus to Neoptolemus.

1367: ξυνήνεσας at least must assuredly be right, even if Blaydes's emendation is not accepted in its entirety² (cf. 1398).

1383. πῶς γὰρ τις αἰσχύνουτ' ἂν ὠφελοῦμενος;

The conjecture ὠφελῶν φίλους should be rejected. Jebb, who supports it with an analysis of the subsequent dialogue, shows no trace of his usual perspicacity. τις refers back to σοί τε κάμοι, but Philoctetes chooses to interpret it as a reference to the Atridae rather than to himself. He charges Neoptolemus

¹ I regret that by an oversight the punctuation of my text has not been corrected.

² ἀλλὰ μ', ὁ ξυνήνεσας, | πέμψον πρὸς οἶκον.

with considering *their* welfare rather than *his* (ἡ 'π' ἐμοὶ τόδε; 'does this concern me?' O.C. 414 καὶ ταῦτ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν Φοῖβος εἰρηκῶς κυρεῖ;). Neoptolemus answers: It is *you*, and I am *your*

friend: that is what I mean. We may justly infer that Socrates and his choice of τὸ ἀφέλαιμον was not far from the poet's thoughts (Zeller's *Socrates*, p. 179, E. tr.).
A. C. PEARSON.

VERGIL AND PLAUTUS.

qui non risere parenti,
nec deus hunc mensa, dea nec dignata cubili
est.

So, according to Quintilian,¹ runs the text of *Eclogue* IV. 62-3; the MSS. have *cui non risere parentes*. That Quintilian's reading gives better sense is reasonably certain; that it is possible grammar is less so. Various scholars, in various languages, have protested against it as a sheer solecism, and emendations such as *hos* or *hinc* have been put forward. And, indeed, it would be pure nonsense to say, for instance, *qui erant in castris milites, hunc eduxit*. But that is because, in such a sentence, the singular and plural numbers would have each its proper meaning, and therefore would contradict each other. In a general statement like Vergil's, it is a matter of indifference which we use; *qui non risere . . . hos* and *qui non risit . . . hunc* would be equally pos-

¹ IX. 3, 8: *qui* and *hunc* are certain, though the quotation has been contaminated with the vulgar texts of Vergil.

sible. So in English it makes not the slightest difference whether we say, 'If a man wants to travel, he must learn French,' or 'If people want to travel, they must learn French.' And consequently we often, illogically but not unintelligibly, combine the two, and say, 'It anyone wants to travel, they must,' etc. And so did colloquial Latin. There is no variant in the following passage of the *Rudens* of Plautus, 1193-4:

satin si quoti homini di esse bene factum
uolunt,
aliquo illud pacto optingit optatum *pii*s.

It can hardly be doubted that the *pii* are the same persons, or is the same person, as the *homo* of the preceding line. 'Surely, if the gods want anyone to prosper, somehow the good fortune comes, if they've been deserving.' That the refined literary Latin of the *Eclogues* has an occasional colloquialism (as III. 50, *numquam hodie effugies*) is no news to students of them.

H. J. ROSE.

NOTES ON JUVENAL.

I. 55 cum leno accipiat moechi bona si
capiendi
ius nullum uxori.

THE *Lex Voconia* seems to have fallen into disuse with the disuse of the censorship. Friedländer suggests that the husband may have had a child by a former marriage, but this hypothesis is perhaps unnecessary. According to a generally accepted view the *Leges Caducariae* did not apply against a man if he had one child, whereas a woman required three to give her full rights. Thus in a household with one or two children the husband would have *ius capiendi*, the wife would not. This may be the case supposed by Juvenal.

III. 14 Iudaeis quorum cophinus faenumque
supellex.

VI. 542 faeno cophinoque relicto.

This passage is inadequately dealt with in the English editions. Mr. Dunbabin has shown in *C.R.* XXXIX., Nos. 5, 6, p. 112, that Duff is in error in supposing that hay would not serve the purpose for which the scholiast says it was intended. The repetition of the phrase suggests that what is meant is a 'hay basket,' not 'hay and a basket,' and that the hay basket, as Friedländer says, was a noteworthy feature of the Jewish household. The view of the scholiast is supported by the following references supplied to me by Mr. J. Walker of Alexandria in Egypt.

(a) *Babylonian Talmud*, translated by Rodkinson and Wise, vol. I², p. 83. 'Wherein may hot vessels be deposited (to retain the heat) and wherein may they not? Depositing in Gepheth (olive waste), dung, salt, lime, and sand, either wet or dry, is not allowed. In straw, grape-skins, wool-flocks, or grass, it is permitted provided they are dry, but not when they are still wet.' Duff suggests that the Jews as beggars might have been content with a cold meal once a week, but Friedländer has pointed out that to the orthodox Jew Sabbath was to be a day of joy, so that even the poorest would try to get a hot meal in spite of the prohibition against cooking.

(b) Some account of the practice is given by Professor A. R. S. Kennedy in *Studia Semitica et Orientalia*, p. 36 (with a reference to Kreugel, *Das Hausgerät in der Mishnah*, p. 40 f.). The pot with its contents still 'piping hot' was placed in a large hamper filled with some non-conductive material and was then covered over.

The word used for 'hamper' is

qubbah, from which are said to be derived Greek *κύπη*, Latin *cupa*, but which still means in Arabic 'a basket.' It has apparently no connexion with *κόφινος*.

I am unable to consult the papers of Rönsch referred to by Friedländer.

III. 215. ardet adhuc, et iam accurrit qui marmora donet, conferat impensas;

Mr. Duff explains *impensae* to mean materials, and quotes three passages in support. There is a somewhat similar use of *impendia* in the *Historia Augusta* (*Vita Alexandri*, XXXII. 3), 'eumque muneratus est ita ut priuatus pro loco suo posset honeste uiuere, his quidem muneribus: agris, bubus, equis, frumento, ferro, impendiis ad faciendam domum, marmoribus ad ornandam et operis quas ratio fabricae requirebat. aurum et argentum raro cuiquam nisi militi diuidebat, etc.'

The context here seems to show that *impendia* refers to materials, and so tends to support the same interpretation of *impensae*. A. CAMERON.

THE ERETRIANS IN CORCYRA.

THREE writers in the third volume of the *Cambridge Ancient History* (Mr. Wade-Gery, p. 535; Dr. Cary, p. 618; and Professor Myres, p. 651) have declared for the Eretrian colony in Corcyra. The case is weaker than their statements would suggest, and some of their arguments illustrate what seem to me dangerous methods of historical reconstruction.

The existence of a pre-Corinthian Eretrian colony upon Corcyra rests upon one literary authority and one alone—Plutarch, *Quaest. Graec.* 11. The statement on p. 618 that it is also attested by Strabo is mistaken. Strabo, X. 1, 5, 449, says that in Corcyra there was a place named Euboea, as there was also in Lemnos and in Argos. Does this attest an Eretrian colony in the Argolid? Euboea was, of course, a cult title of Hera, and this no doubt explains the distribution of the place-name. The cult of Hera also explains the presence in Corcyra of one of the entourage of that goddess, the nymph Makris, upon whose slender shoulders Wilamowitz (*Hom. Untersuch.*, p. 172) rests some of the weight of the alleged Eretrian colony. It is not impossible that Beloch (*Gr. Gesch.*² I., p. 247) may be right in thinking that the whole story of the Eretrians in Corcyra has arisen from a misunderstanding in antiquity as to the significance of the place-name.

Now Dr. Cary lends a special weight to the attestation of Plutarch by a device of which we

have probably all been guilty at some time or other. Plutarch has 'a specialist's knowledge of Central Greece.' That, of course, is quite true, and it lends great weight to his information upon certain points—e.g., what was the ritual or tradition of Delphi in his time. But it does not seem to me to give him any particular authority for an event nine hundred years or so before. Further, though it cannot be proved, unless a fortunate chance should bring us the right papyrus, anyone who is thoroughly familiar with the *Greek Questions* is likely to agree with Giessen (*Philologus*, 60, pp. 468-9) that there are heavy odds in favour of this story being taken by Plutarch either from the *Constitution of Corcyra* or from the *Constitution of Methone*, the former existence of both of which is attested by surviving citations. I should myself prefer the *Constitution of Methone* for an anecdote explaining a derisive (?) nickname applied to the Methonaeans. As we know from experience of the *Ath. Pol.*, the Aristotelian Constitutions are at best patchwork, and the historical value of statements in them depends upon the particular source. Upon the face of it this story belongs to a kind of aetiological anecdote which can hardly be said to possess very much greater historical value than most of the tales in *Little Arthur's History of England*. It is at best poor evidence.

Now the real argument for an Euboean colony of some sort is that it has seemed hardly credible that Euboeans when developing

their western movement should have left Corcyra out. Hence every effort has been made to bolster up the passage in Plutarch from other sources.

Dr. Cary tells us that the approximation of Carystian and Corcyraean coins supports the Eretrian colony, and shows that Carystus took part in it. A is said to have colonised C; B has a coin standard near that of C; therefore A and B colonised C. Is that really logical? There is no other evidence that Carystus had anything to do with colonising Corcyra.

Actually we have two other accounts of the colonisation of Corcyra by Corinth, both of which know nothing of the alleged Eretrian predecessors. According to Ephorus the Corinthians drove out Liburnians (Strabo, VI. 2, 4, 269); according to Timaeus (*Schol. Ap. Rhod.* IV. 1212, 1216, *F.H.G.* [Müller] I. p. 203) they ejected the Colchians. In both the Corinthians are the first Greek settlers. The Colchians have, of course, come in from the Argonaut saga; the Liburnians are presumably aborigines akin to those of the rest of the Illyrian coast and islands.

Professor Myres tells us (p. 651) that the Eretrians colonised Corcyra, that Liburnian 'pirates' came and drove them out, then Corinthians came and drove the Liburnians out. Now I submit that this process, though very commonly employed, of harmonising two contradictory traditions by combining them to form a third which disagrees with both, is very unconvincing. The tradition gives us a choice of Corinthians driving out either Eretrians or some non-Greek people; there is no hint anywhere of a non-Greek people driving out the Eretrians.

I am concerned only to point out that the case for the prior Eretrian colony is very weak. I cannot substantiate its non-existence, though I cannot help feeling that had it been an established tradition in the fifth century Thucydides would have given it passing mention. To arrive at certainty seems impossible. The early traditions of Corfu are even more difficult to evaluate than those of other Greek settlements. The early identification of Phaeacia and the western development of the Argonaut saga, as to the historical value of which I should not agree with Professor Myres, have begun the confusion. And then one cannot help suspecting that the Corinthian settlement has been very greatly post-dated in order to achieve one of those tidy synchronisms which Greek tradition loved. That Corinthians were in Corcyra long before Syracuse was founded, and that that perhaps is why neither Chalcidians nor Eretrians settled there, seems to me quite possible; but I do not pretend that it can be justified by evidence, nor claim for it greater authority than that of a personal superstition of my own.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

SOPHOCLES, *ANTIGONE* 909 ff.
(C.R. XXXIX. p. 151.)

IN his interesting note upon this passage Mr. Mavrogordato has missed, I venture to think, its real interest for students of folk-tale, which was first pointed out by Pischel, *Hermes* XXVIII., 1893, pp. 465 ff. The matter is borrowed from the work of the poet's friend Herodotus (III., 119), the Persian story of *Intaphernes' Wife*. But the same motif also occurs in the earliest known stratum of Indian stories; for it is found both in the *Jatakas* and in the *Ramayana*, which here appear to draw upon a common and earlier source. It is, therefore, an example of a story contact which can be traced in European literature before the foundation of Alexandria. For the problem raised by such contacts, and my reasons for conjecturing that the true explanation may lie in a diffusion East and West from a common centre in the Persian Empire, I may refer to my papers in *Folk-Lore*, XXXIV., pp. 117-140, and *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, XI., pp. 95-102.

I am not sure whether it has been previously noticed that a different tale, but belonging to the same genre of 'what dear ones are replaceable,' occurs in the Egyptian story of the deserters (Herodotus II., 30). The genre is fairly common in ballad literature, as Mr. Mavrogordato has indicated. An example occurs in a Bulgarian gypsy version of 'The Song of the Bridge,' which will shortly be published in the *Journal of the Gypsy Lore Society*.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

ANOTHER FRAGMENT OF THE
HYPSIPYLE?

IN Volume II. of the *Petrie Papyri* there is a 'Tragic Fragment' numbered XLIX. (d) DX, which runs:

σε τον δυσώνυμον
εμφανη παιδος μορον
τω συνασπον
δε και φησιν κτανειν
φως ποινας οπως
ς εικотως
ελεγεν
εμοι
ηται

The original has disappeared and Mahaffy gives no description. I suggest, however, that this fragment really belongs to P. Petrie XLIX. (c), now British Museum Papyrus 590—which was identified by F. Petersen in *Hermes*, XLIX. (1914), p. 156, as from the *Hypsipyle* of Euripides. A close parallel to the above lines will be found in the speech of Hypsipyle to Amphiarao (P. Oxy. VI. 852, fragment 60, ll. 34-36):

ειπε τιδε συμφοραν τέκνον·
παρόν γάρ ολσθα· φησι δ' ἥδ' ἐκουσίως
κτανεῖν με παῖδα κατὰβουλεύσαι δόμοις.

The *δυσώνυμος* must surely be *Archemoros*. The exact position of the lines in the play must remain a conjecture.

H. J. M. MILNE.

CIC. AD FAM. VII. 1. 1.

'Neque tamen dubito quin tu in illo cubiculo no, ex quo tibi Stabianum perforasti et patefecisti sinum, per eos dies matutina tempora lectiunculis consumpseris, cum illi interea, qui te istic reliquerunt, spectarent communis mimos semisomni.'

THIS is the Oxford Text reading of a corrupt passage, not yet convincingly emended. In the preceding sentence Cicero says he is glad that Marius, to whom he is writing, has enjoyed his 'otium,' provided only that he has made good use of it ('modo ut tibi constiterit fructus oti tui'), i.e. to get on with his literary work. 'And yet,' he continues in our passage—and 'tamen' here obviously means 'in spite of the claims of literature'—'I doubt not that you spent your morning hours,' not, surely, in any sort of reading, but, as the context almost forces us to infer, 'in admiring the scenery.'

'Lectiunculis' is a snag in the current of the context, and incompatible with 'tamen.' It is curious that so accurate a translator as Mr. E. S. Shuckburgh should have rendered 'tamen' here as though it were 'enim,' of which there seems to be no trace in the MSS. Did he, too, recognise the impossibility of reconciling 'tamen' with 'lectiunculis'? Klotz seems to have been on the right track in coining and uttering 'spectiunculis'; but, unless it is textually indefensible, why not 'spectaculis,' anticipating and balancing the coming 'spectarent'?

'Sinum' is Boot's suspiciously facile conjec-

ture for 'senum' ('Misenum' Lambinus); according to Nobbe, Benedict, though not quoted by Tyrrell and Purser, suggested 'scenam,' which (especially if originally written 's'enam') would account for the strange persistence of 'sen' in the codd., and incidentally support 'spectaculis' (or 'spectiunculis').

Again, there is the doubtful 'in' before 'illo cubiculo,' where Dr. Tyrrell, in spite of its difficulty, gallantly defends the 'ex' of the MSS., explaining it as an instance of 'inverse attraction'; but if 'spectaculis' be read, 'ex' hardly needs defence.

Professor Reid's 'perforando patefecisti' for 'perforasti et p.' is irresistible.

Adopting these alterations, then — 'ex' for 'in' before 'illo cubiculo,' 'Stabianum perforando patefecisti scenam' for 'Stabianum p. et p. sinum,' and 'spectaculis' for 'lectiunculis'—we should have a plainly intelligible sentence with nicely-balanced clauses, which might be diffusely paraphrased as follows: 'And yet (in spite of your literary labours) I have no doubt that you, looking out of that bedchamber of yours, from which, by making a gap' (either by inserting a new casement in the wall of the house, or, more probably, by felling trees) 'you have opened up for your own private benefit a view of the Stabian stage, spent the morning hours' (when the sun would not be in your eyes) 'during all those days in gazing at your scenes, when they meantime, who left you where you are, were gazing at farces on the public stage, and were hardly able to keep awake.' W. GLYNN WILLIAMS.

REVIEWS

ATTIC VASE PAINTERS.

Attische Vasenmaler des rotfigurigen Stils.

By J. D. BEAZLEY. One vol. Pp. xii + 612. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1925. Unbound, M. 21; bound, M. 24.50.

IN his *Vases in American Museums*, published in 1918, Professor Beazley gave an account of the main groups into which he had divided Attic red-figure vases and of the chief vase-artists he had discovered. But he was somewhat hampered in having to relate his attributions to specific vases in American museums. Meanwhile he has added largely to his material and now at last gives us his complete list of attributions.

The present book, written in German and published in Germany, is composed of lists of the vases attributed to vase-artists, who are arranged in chronological order. Apart from very brief

comments on the artists the bare lists have to speak for themselves. The impressive magnitude of the work will be realised when it is known that the lists occupy 460 pages, that some 5,000 vases or fragments are attributed to the hand of some painter, and that 177 painters are distinguished, the large majority of whom are Professor Beazley's discovery.

The importance of Professor Beazley's work, mentioned when his *Vases in American Museums* was reviewed in these columns, is probably now sufficiently realised to need no further comment here. But an important question may well be asked, What is to be the outcome of Professor Beazley's completed researches? If his attributions are right (and it is probable that most of them will be confirmed by those who are able to check his conclusions) it is

very desirable that they should influence the way in which vases are arranged in museums. As far as possible the works of an artist should be grouped together and labelled as a group. By this means the enjoyment of the student and of the amateur should be very much increased. No one but a specialist is likely to have the time to pick out in a large collection of vases the works of a single vase-artist and consider them together, but if the vases are grouped the process of becoming acquainted with the individuality of an artist is

made comparatively easy and quick; and on such acquaintance a great part of the pleasure to be got from Attic vases rests.

One of the fitting conclusions of the work that Professor Beazley, his predecessors and colleagues have done would be that Attic red-figure vases should altogether cease to be a mass of ill-distinguished material, and become for any intelligent observer a class of works of art in which the personalities of many artists stand out as clearly as in the Dutch paintings of domestic life.

E. M. W. TILLYARD.

DEMOSTHENES IN THE EYES OF THE ANCIENTS.

Demosthenes im Urteile des Altertums (von Theopompos bis Tzetzes; Geschichte, Roman, Legende). Von ENGELBERT DRERUP. One vol. Pp. 264. Würzburg, 1923.

DRERUP is 'a bonny fighter.' His *Aus einer alten Advokatenrepublik* was an onslaught on the lawyer-politician. In the preface to this volume he returns to the charge: 'Die Kaiser und Könige sind geflohen, abgesetzt, ausser Landes getrieben, gestorben, ermordet; die Advokaten haben gesiegt.—Denn auch in unserm einst so stolzen Vaterland herrscht heute eine Republik der Gasse und der Demagogen, deren sich ein Kleon und der Wursthändler des Aristophanes nicht zu schämen brauchten.' Yet there is a President in Germany.

In 1805, when Germany was under Napoleon's heel, the works of Demosthenes were a clarion-call to German youth. To Niebuhr Demosthenes was the burning patriot, the far-sighted statesman, the champion of freedom. It is a far cry from Niebuhr to Drerup. Not so far to Clemenceau's flaming eulogy. For the latter, Phocion is 'un citoyen intègre, général intrépide, mais défaitiste obstiné'; against Demosthenes all charges fall to the ground—as inconsistent with the character of Demosthenes! So hard is it to read history save through the darkling glass of our own predilections.

The present work is one of vast erudition and penetrating acuteness of judgment. It is fair in tone. It is not unworthy of the accomplished editor of Isocrates, of the brilliant scholar whose

services to the Demosthenes text it would be difficult to over-estimate. It can give no higher praise.

No one of Demosthenes' contemporaries passes a favourable verdict on Demosthenes; not Aeschines, not Hypereides, not Deinarchos, nor another. Pytheas is full of personal invective; the pointed *Δημάδεια* give us the *chronique scandaleuse* of Athens. Theopompos and Ephoros are equally unfavourable. They were, it is true, of Macedonian sympathies, or, at least, 'above the narrow political standpoint of Athenian particularists.' Not even in Aristotle is there a trace of approval.

The charge of corruption by Persian gold, originated by Aeschines, reinforced by Hypereides, Deinarchos, and Demetrios of Phaleron, became the *crambe repetita* of school declamation.¹ The 'Demosthenes-roman' we owe to the Peripatetic biography, to Idomeneus of Lampsakos, Hermippos of Smyrna, Satyros and Sotion—gossip-mongers one and all. The piquant anecdote, the scandalous repartee, largely drawn from comedy, passed into the historical writing of the third century which aimed at story, not history. The Demosthenes-legend was fathered by Demochares in his *History of His Own Times*. In 280 B.C. we have the bronze statue erected in honour of Demo-

¹ Add *Berliner Klassiker Texte* VI., p. 10 (Kunst, 1923). 'D. had an honest policy where there was no one to bribe him. Otherwise, περιηλθὲν σε ἡ πλεονεξία καὶ κατίσχυε τοῦ ἐν σοὶ λογισμοῦ' κ.τ.λ.

sthenes, with the famous epigram engraved on its pedestal. Drerup (p. 87-8) regards this as a political demonstration of the moment; 'it hardly proves that the evil reputation which the orator had in contemporary literature was regarded as a slander.' It was Hieronymos of Rhodes who initiated the unbounded admiration of Demosthenes in the schools: he praises the agonistic quality of Demosthenes as contrasted with the lifelessness of Isocrates.

This is but a brief summary of a minute discussion that extends from Theopompos to Tzetzes. The treatment of Plutarch, pseudo-Plutarch, and Lucian's *Encomium* is especially worthy of note.

I can hardly subscribe to Drerup's view that there is no contemporary evidence in favour of Demosthenes: cf. Dein. c. Aristog., § 16 *Δημάδῃ καὶ Δημοσθένει . . . οἷς εἰ μὴ πάντ' ἀλλὰ πολλά γε συνῆστε χρήσιμα πολιτευομένοις*. The approbation is *ad hoc*, and Deinarchos was no Sir Hubert Stanley. But the whole Athenian people showed Demosthenes a signal honour in selecting him to pronounce the laudation of those who fell at Chaeronea. Drerup's attempt to minimise this fails to carry conviction (*Aus einer alten A.*, p. 140). Demosthenes continued to hold office, and when he tholed his assize in 330 B.C., it was to the triumphant vindication of his policy. Nor do I believe that Persia in the fourth century was a serious menace to Greece. And the 'romantic sentimentality which regards the day of Chaeronea as the death-day of Greek freedom' (*Aus einer alten A.*, p. 135) was shared by Lykurgos,¹ who speaks of Chaeronea 'where the liberties of Greece were buried in the graves of the fallen.'

Drerup's insistence that Demosthenes was a hero of phrase and gesture, devoid of political insight and of no high personal integrity, is a wholesome antidote to such superlatives as 'a burning patriotism combined with the religious zeal of a prophet, the practical statesman, who in the sweep of his eloquence never fails to point out the concrete

way to success, the moral idealist' etc.² But is it true?

Demosthenes was no doubt disingenuous—in XIX. 111-3, he denies his own share in the transactions with which he deals. In VIII. 7 he is unstinting in self-praise. The common authorship of XXXVI. and XLV. is hard to defend. In IX. 15 he descends to downright lies. Demosthenes was a politician, and a Greek politician.

But bribery is another matter. Hypereides³ accuses Demosthenes of having received bribes from the Persian king, from Harpalos, and from Alexander, besides 60 talents from the sale of honorary decrees! In col. xix. he shows his hand: 'By taking the middle course Demosthenes has prevented other satraps from deserting from Alexander.' Taking this in conjunction with the defence imputed to Demosthenes, 'that it was to pleasure Alexander that the council was willing to ruin him' (col. xiv.), I find the report of the Areopagus intelligible. In col. iii. Hypereides waxes indignant—*συκοφαντεῖς τὴν βουλὴν, ἐρωτῶν πόθεν ἔλαβες τὸ χρυσίον, καὶ τίς ἦν σοι ὁ δούς, καὶ ποῦ*. But these are highly pertinent questions.

It is easy to accuse Demosthenes of lack of political insight after the event. But Demosthenes might reasonably assume that the Macedonian monarchy would crumble at the death of Philip. He was not to foresee that a great father was to be followed by a greater son. He was not to foresee that Greek culture was to penetrate the East, that Athens was destined to die to herself to live to mankind. Had he foreseen it, he might well have relucted against such a diffuse and insensible immortality.

To Drerup Demosthenes is the rhetor *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. Clemenceau is dissatisfied with Dion. Hal.'s tribute to Demosthenes' eloquence 'puisque la parole ne peut être que vain bruit sans l'action. Au sens achevé du mot, Demosthène fut un homme. C'est assez. A y bien regarder, c'est beaucoup.' One is reminded of Plutarch, chap. xii. *ὁμολογεῖν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀπεχθανομένους ὅτι πρὸς ἑνδοξον αὐτοῖς ἀνθρώπων ὁ ἀγὼν ἐστὶ*.

W. RENNIE.

¹ Against Leokrates, § 53.

² Botsford, *Hellenic History*, p. 436, published in 1922.

³ Col. xxiv.

ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

Notes critiques sur l'Histoire d'Alexandre : première série. By GEORGES RADET. Pp. 86. Bordeaux: Feret et Fils; Paris: Boccard, Klincksieck, 1925.

IN 1895 Professor Radet put forward, simultaneously with Kaerst, the theory of Alexander's divine world-kingdom; and his forthcoming book on Alexander will be welcomed. The work here noticed is a reprint of six of his preliminary articles from the *Revue des Études anciennes*; there are others, and seemingly there is to be a second series. In this series, the first article settles that Alexander visited Ilium once only. The second examines Philostratus' story of the Thessalian theoriai to Achilles' tomb, with its attractive picture of Alexander's Thessalian cavalry galloping round the tomb and invoking the aid of Achilles' horses, Balios and Xanthos; there is a juridical appendix by Professor Paul Huvelin on the stones suspended over the Thessalian defaulters. The third seeks to show that the Phrygians, like others, believed in a central omphalos of the earth, theirs being the chariot at Gordium, presumably (like Priam's) furnished with an omphalos. The fourth is a careful analysis of the negotiations between Darius and Alexander, with a

decided preference for Curtius' version. The fifth deals with the story of the Tyrians chaining the statue of Apollo. To the list here given of chained deities may be added Apelles' painting of Alexander at Susa leading Ares in chains; for Radet's evidence shows that the latest interpretation of this picture (Birt, *Alexander der Grosse und das Weltgriechentum*, p. 213) as meaning that Alexander had finished with war—extremely important if true—is misconceived; you chained a god to prevent him joining your opponents. The last article is a recent study of Alexander's visit to Ammon. Radet makes a spirited defence of Diodorus' story of the oracle, but it entails his believing in three propositions, all alike (in my view) unfounded and improbable: that stories of Alexander's divine birth were previously in circulation, that the king arranged matters beforehand with the priests, and that Diodorus' story must stand or fall as a whole. And he does not mention that four years passed before Alexander took any notice of the subject-matter of this wonderful oracle, and four more before anything really happened. Perhaps his book will deal with this awkward gap.

W. W. TARN.

AN ITALIAN EDITION OF HERODAS.

Eroda: I Mimiambi. Testo critico e commento per cura di NICOLA TERZAGHI. Pp. viii + 200. Turin: Chiantore, 1925. Introduzione e traduzione di N. T. Pp. 100. Turin: Paravia, 1925.

FROM this—the first edition of Herodas in Italian—Italian students will get a very curious notion of the author. It is difficult to find any point at which the editor is right-minded: for instance, at VIII. 45 he combines the two hopeless readings *δισμυρί(α)* and *ἕκ τε γῆς λείης*. His critical notes are curious to a degree; it is interesting news e.g. to learn that in VIII. 35 *ωρηνειχε* are the only letters visible; whereas, in fact, two of these (ε) are wholly invisible, there is an ε before *ωρην* and at a distance

of two letters from *ιχ[ε, θιρ]* (or σ) is easily legible in Nairn's facsimile, which T. has made no effort to use. Hence no doubt we may explain the fact that in v. 33, where the Cambridge edition gave five letters between *κοθορνου* and σ (probably one too many), he gives cheerfully eight! In fact the doubtful letter is η, and there are only three-and-a-half letters missing before it, e.g. *κνήμη κ[ο]θορνου [νιατ]η κα[τ]αζωστρη [ιλικτο]*: for after all it is the upper part of the foot or lower part of the *κνήμη* round which laces go. Again in 46 *ναλεσθαι κηλαζαν* with crit. n.: 'restituito e supplito dall' Herzog.' Yet in fact there is no letter missing in this verse at all, and Herzog never enters, nor professed to enter, into the matter

any more than the man in the moon. T. uses cheerfully the same fragment twice (like Mr. Edmonds¹), once at VIII. 38 and once at IX. 12. His remark that all the loose fragments of papyrus were placed in Mime VIII. (see p. 399 of Headlam's edition) is a curious give-away. These mistakes are probably due to an ignorance of German and English; but Signor Terzaghi is still more unfortunately handicapped by a complete ignorance of the Greek language and of Greek metre. Here is the papyrus reading of VIII. 65:

κα[]ρουτι[]ωνεληξισουενδυ[]
..]ναδ[]...]ωδε κτλ.

(In the first words there is no difficulty: I ought to have cited Soph. *Aj.* 294 *κἀγὼ μαθοῦς' ἔληξ[α]*—'that was all he said to me,' Xen. *Anab.* I. 3. 12, Theocr. I. 138; and on the *ἐνδυτον*, Pind. *Nem.* I. 74.)

Here is Terzaghi's version: *καὶ τοῦτ' ἰδὼν ἔλεξα τὸ ἐνδυτον ἂν μου δοῦναι τιν' ὦδε.*² (I cannot find out what has become of the third letter of 66.) Indeed, it is hard to find any monstrous error in Greek which Terzaghi has not followed. The reading *κ[ο]σμεῖς* VIII. 76 (with *ῆ* or *ῃ*) and the second singular in *v.* 78,

which is the most glaring error of the Cambridge edition—for the accusative *Μοῦσαν* appeals always to a *third* person—has been followed as enthusiastically by Signor Terzaghi as by Mr. Edmonds (*l.c.*). Incidentally may I remark that *ῆ* *με* (or *μου*) . . . *ῆ* *με* is sufficiently guaranteed by Eur. *Bacch.* 443 (surely our best authority for a Dionysiac poem), that the relative with the *third* person is sufficiently attested *e.g.* by Eur. *Cycl.* 262 *μὰ τὸν Ποσειδῶ τὸν τεκόντα σ' ὦ Κύκλωψ*, that in *v.* 77 *ἐμοῖς* (Herzog) (preferable to Milne's *τιμῆς*?) with *Ξουθίδαις* = *Ἀθηναίοις*, and finally that the missing main verb can be more easily got by correcting *ἐπίουσι* into *ἐπιθύσει* than by a supplement after *τὸν πάλαι*?

Signor Terzaghi appears to proceed on curiously erroneous hypotheses (*e.g.*, p. 188, 'un autore come Eroda non si serve di modi di dire rare e difficili ma usa e deve forzosamente usare il linguaggio del volgo') by arguments of interminable length to a conclusion which bears no relation to Greek, no relation to the letters of the papyrus, and little relation to reason of any kind, while to defend, as he appears to do, the verbal inspiration of Crusius with theological warmth, is only possible by concealment of the fact that at no place (*e.g.* VII. 105-8), recently, has it ever been found to accord with subsequent discoveries.

A. D. KNOX.

HELLENISTIC ASIA MINOR.

Die Grenzen der hellenistischen Staaten in Kleinasien. Von DR. PHIL. ERNST MEYER. Octavo. Pp. xvi + 186; 5 maps. Zurich: Inst. Orell Füssli, 1925.

DR. MEYER here gives us what we never had before, a comprehensive account of the political changes in the map of Asia Minor during that exhausting period of Hellenistic rule which flung the gates open to Rome. Beginning in Part I with the empires of Alexander (to 321 B.C.), Antigonos (to 301), and Lysimachus (to 281), we survey the territorial possessions in Asia Minor of the Ptolemies, of Rhodes, of the Ionian cities, of the

Pergamene, Bithynian, Pontine and Cappadocian kings, lastly of the Seleucid dynasty, and all fluctuations in their frontiers from 301 to the Peace of Apamea (188 B.C.). A difficult task successfully accomplished. There follow an appendix on the geographical balance of power after Apamea, a list of fifty-one additions and corrections (to which several could now be added), two good indices, and five outline maps.

So useful a book—a sort of international third-century *Baedeker*—should be brought up to date and reissued every few years; it strikingly illustrates the value of epigraphy as handmaid to

¹ *C.Q.* 1925, 3-4 at VIII. 25, 39. In the first case Terzaghi gives seven letters before *φη*; before *εν* or *εγο* he gives twenty.

² Compare VIII. 38 *τέλος δ' ἐφήκε πρὸς τοῦτο πάντα λακτίζειν*, which he attributes to Herzog!

history, and shows how the light from inscriptions, coins, and papyri has enabled us to see details in the landscape which till lately were dim and forty years ago completely dark. For instance, one text, *Milet I*, 3 (1914), no. 139, has settled, at about 260 B.C., the long debated date of the collapse, which lasted fourteen years, of Ptolemaic sea-power; compare Meyer, p. 91, note 2, with Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (1913), App. xii. So also the coin published by Hill, *Anatolian Studies pr. to Ramsay* (1923), p. 211, establishes the connexion with Lysimachus of Ptolemy 'Telmessius'; cf. Wilamowitz, *Litteris*, i, 1924, p. 13. Meyer, p. 47, note 1, overlooks this and needs correction.

In so vast a view many points are still, of course, more or less open to

question, of which fact the author usually warns us by 'wohl,' 'wahrscheinlich,' etc. Once, however, this warning partly fails: on p. 136 the general peace under which large districts were ceded to Eumenes is dated in 252 B.C., whereas in the footnote to p. 93 that date bears the proper qualification 'wie es scheint.' The name of the *phyle Apollonis* at Bithynion (Boli) may have commemorated the god, instead of the queen Apollonis to whom it is here ascribed (p. 150). The Panamara inscriptions nos. 2 and 3, mentioned on p. 71, are united and restored by Oppermann, *Zeus Panamaros* (1924), pp. 20-21. Several more illustrative maps would be appreciated in the next edition.

W. H. BUCKLER.

THE TEXT OF PSEUDO-ARISTOTLE *DE MUNDO*.

The Text Tradition of Pseudo-Aristotle 'De Mundo.' Some Notes on the Text of Pseudo-Aristotle 'De Mundo.' By W. L. LORIMER, M.A. (St. Andrews University Publications, XVIII. and XXI.) Pp. ix + 95, ix + 148. Oxford University Press: Humphrey Milford, 1924-5. 3s. 6d. and 5s. net.

IN these two pamphlets Mr. Lorimer has given us a most thorough study of the MSS. and of the other evidence for the text of the *De Mundo*. In fact, perhaps no part of the Aristotelian corpus has been so carefully examined, so far as the tradition goes, by any English-speaking scholar; only Mr. Fobes's text of the *Meteorologica* can be compared with Mr. Lorimer's study in elaborateness. A point of interest which is discussed at the very beginning is the date of the *De Mundo*. Zeller is content to date it between B.C. 50 and A.D. 100; Mr. Lorimer, more definitely, thinks it was written between A.D. 40 and 140. The only reason, however, that he gives for the *terminus a quo* is the use of the phrase *ὅσπερ ἀμέλει*, which does not occur elsewhere before Plutarch and Dio Chrysostom. *ἀμέλει* occurs, however, in the sense of 'for instance' in Theophrastus. At any time after this *ὅσπερ ἀμέλει* might

easily have occurred, and its absence from other authors does not force us to push the *De Mundo* as late as Mr. Lorimer does.

Bekker cites only four MSS. for the *De Mundo*; Mr. Lorimer has traced no fewer than seventy-six, ranging in age from the (mainly) eleventh century Paris MS. which he calls A (Bekker's R) downwards. He has collated nineteen MSS. and acquired much valuable information about many others, including opinions as to their date from modern palaeographers. He holds that the MS. tradition cannot be broken up into mutually exclusive families, but that it can be divided into groups between which there has been a good deal of interpenetration. The main groups he recognises are:

1. B (a thirteenth-century MS. at Jerusalem), D (thirteenth century, Paris), + C (thirteenth century, Florence), G (thirteenth or fourteenth century, Rome).
2. Q (fifteenth century, Venice), Z (sixteenth century, Paris), with the Aldine *editio princeps*.
3. F (thirteenth to fourteenth century, Florence).
4. A, E (thirteenth or fourteenth century, Rome), H (ditto), P (fifteenth century, Rome).

He is inclined to think that most of the uncollated MSS. belong to this last group. He holds F inferior to the other three groups, and these about equal in value to each other, and suggests [that if we were limited to four MSS. it would be best to build an eclectic text on A (and E or H from 397 b 30, where A stops), G, P, and Z.

The indirect tradition is very rich. We have in Stobaeus excerpts including nearly two-thirds of the *De Mundo*, and the text of these does not seem to have been affected by the direct tradition during the Middle Ages. Mr. Lorimer holds that it is possible in a large measure to reconstruct a common archetype of the text in Stobaeus and in BDCG. Of versions we have (1) one by L. Apuleius (born c. A.D. 125), which is so free that it is usually hard to say definitely what Greek text he had before him. (2) An Armenian version which is assigned to dates varying from the fifth to the ninth century. It has most affinities with BDCG. (3) A sixth-century Syriac version, which cannot be connected specially with any group of the Greek MSS. (4) An anonymous Latin version probably made in the thirteenth century for Manfred of Sicily. Its affinities are with AEHP. (5) The thirteenth or fourteenth-century Latin version of 'Nicholaus Siculus,' also akin to AEHP.

There are in all, Mr. Lorimer tells us, some forty passages in which two or more members of the indirect tradition have a reading unknown to the direct. There are, however, at most twelve false readings universal in the direct and unknown to the indirect tradition.

Mr. Lorimer thinks that the archetype of the direct tradition must long antedate Stobaeus and the Syriac translation, and is probably earlier even than Apuleius, but that 'there was from the very first a continual criss-crossing of the lines of tradition,' so that a thoroughly eclectic procedure is necessary in the reconstruction of the text.

The earlier of the two pamphlets concludes with transcripts (based on the collation of several MSS.) of both the Latin versions.

The first subject discussed in the later pamphlet is the history of the QZ^{Ald.} group. Mr. Lorimer has now collated three more MSS. of this group, and gives an exhaustive account of the agreements and differences within the group, and between it and others. He thinks the whole group is descended from the fourteenth-century Paris MS. which he calls W, and that this was in turn copied from the fourteenth-century MS. which he calls Fl. 19, of the AEHP group, and corrected from another MS. belonging to the BDCG group. Thus WQZ^{Ald.} (as well as F) are hybrids between the two main groups AEHP and BDCG.

The remainder of the pamphlet is occupied with valuable discussions of single passages, in which many topics of interest—ancient estimates of the size of Great Britain and Ireland, the names of Zeus, the order of the planets, etc.—find exhaustive treatment. It is much to be hoped that these preliminary brochures will soon be followed by the critical text which Mr. Lorimer promises us. It will certainly mark a vast improvement on the somewhat perfunctory efforts of all previous editors.

W. D. Ross.

DELOS.

Exploration archéologique de Délos, faite par l'Ecole française d'Athènes. VIII. *Le Quartier du Théâtre: étude sur l'habitation délienne à l'époque hellénistique.* By JOSEPH CHAMONARD. Plans and drawings by H. Convert, A. Gabriel, G. Poulsen, and J. Replat. Pp. x+463; 253 illustra-

tions and 66 plates. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1922 (pp. 1-232, Plates I-XXVII.); 1925 (pp. 233-463, Plates XXVIII-LXVI.). Fasc. I., 200 francs; Fasc. II., 200 francs; Atlas of Plates, 100 francs.

Délos. By PIERRE ROUSSEL. (*Le Monde Hellénique: Archéologie-His-*

toire-Paysages. Fasc. I.) Pp. 45; thirty-six illustrations, two maps in one. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925. 5 francs.

CHAMONARD's magnificent publication, excellent in detail, is even more impressive as a whole. His theme is complicated, but we are familiarised, by gradual steps, with the history of the excavation (made possible by the generosity of the Duc de Loubat), and with the lie of the ruins, and are then conducted round them, house by house, with the help of two admirable plans, and many good drawings and photographs. Chamonard next generalises the facts about such recurring features as streets, drains, upper storeys, and courts, and finally devotes half the book to a still broader treatment of construction and technique. The student will not find much discussion of Greek houses as a whole, but he will find something rarer and more valuable—a full and candid presentation of all the facts about one most important site. The Theatre Quarter is an ill-planned jumble of jerry-built houses, reflecting Delos' precarious prosperity between the middle of the third and the opening of the first century B.C. After the disasters of 88 and 69 B.C., the district was almost deserted, and was stripped of marble and metal, though not of frescoes or mosaics. Within the limits of this review it is impossible to give much detail, but the following facts may be mentioned. All the houses had courts from the first, but all peristyles are here late and often imperfect intrusions of a type established elsewhere. No house had originally two courts, and there are no clearly marked women's quarters. Upper storeys are universal, and often richer than the ground-floors: but one upper floor, and

a total height of 30 or 40 feet, seem to be the limit. Almost all houses had one or more chief rooms presenting their long sides to the court. There were many windows, but never so placed as to destroy privacy. The roofs were mostly flat, and the rainwater from them was conveyed to covered cisterns (usually under the courts), which were carefully guarded from contamination. This was the only drinking-water, for the numerous wells tapped an untrustworthy stratum, the elaborate drainage being very imperfect—a system of leaky inaccessible sewers under the streets, which carried to the sea the refuse of the almost universal latrines. Twenty-eight of these have been identified (some in upper storeys): they were flushed only with slops, and the sewers were not connected with the surface drainage of the streets. Mosaics and paintings are here well but summarily treated, in view of Bulard's work, published and promised. The book was almost ready before the war, which accounts for the regrettable lack of references to Birnbaum's work on Vitruvius. Printing and illustration are excellent, but there are many slips and misprints in the innumerable references to plans and figures. The *Errata* correct some thirty, and I have noticed as many more, apart from the numerous inaccuracies of the Index. Those in the text cause delay, but are seldom baffling to an attentive reader.

In Roussel's short book, the pictures are so small, and the facts so complicated, that little idea can be gathered of the material remains, especially as the only plans are in the almost undecipherable maps. But the main interest lies in the brilliant summary of the social and political history of the island.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

GREEK ACCENTUATION.

On Ancient Greek Accentuation. By J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D., F.B.A. From the Proceedings of the British Academy. Vol. XI. Pp. 52. London: at the Oxford University Press (Humphrey Milford), 1925. Paper, 5s. net.

In his *A Short Guide to the Accentuation of Ancient Greek* (London, 1924), which I

noticed in the *Classical Review*, Vol. XXXIX., p. 195, Professor Postgate adopted the dogmatic style customary in such works. The present pamphlet supplies the reasoning upon which he based his decision of certain difficult points. It appears that in composing the *Guide* he studied the ancient and modern

literature, and carefully weighed the evidence there presented, but that he did not undertake any very laborious investigation of his own. I do not mean to blame him for following the course which almost any scholar would have taken in the circumstances, but rather to explain the fact that the pages here under review do not greatly advance our knowledge of the subject.

Professor Postgate is, of course, not blind to the need of further investigation. One of the most suggestive things in the pamphlet is the plea for an accurate study of the manuscript evidence on Greek accentuation. This is almost a virgin field, which should not be longer neglected. It is the sort of work that can be done a bit at a time by a number of scholars; here are many good topics for doctors' dissertations and small researches by busy teachers.

In general I find myself in agreement with the author's views on the moot points discussed. I am particularly pleased with his rejection (p. 2) of the scepticism of certain scholars about the reliability of our sources; but he should not object (p. 14) to Petersen's statement 'that all our knowledge of accent comes from the Alexandrian grammarians . . . and that we never can be quite sure how old their accentuation is.' The Alexandrians had considerable knowledge of Attic and other dialects and even a valuable tradition of Homeric accent; but we must not expect from them a complete knowledge of any earlier system. There is no reason to suppose, however, that Hellenistic Greek differed from Attic more in accent than other respects which we can more readily control.

About half of the pamphlet (pp. 10-37) is devoted to a discussion of 'Wheeler's law,' whose purport is that oxytone words ending in a dactyl become paroxytone. As to the dactylic nouns in *ῖον*, Professor Postgate thinks that oxytonesis was original; the nominal suffixes *ῖον*, *ῖσκος*, *ῖς*, and *ῖδης* contain, he thinks, an Indo-European accented *ī*, which may

be identified with the demonstrative stem seen in Latin *is*, Sanskrit *idam*, Greek *iv*, etc. This etymology is open to insuperable objections, and, even if true, it would not help in the least to explain the peculiarities of Greek accent which it is intended to explain. We cannot separate *ῖον* from the adjective suffix *ῖος*, and the latter admittedly had various accent in the parent speech. So had *ῖσκος*, if we may judge from the names of a Thracian river *Ἀρτισκός*, a Dacian river *Τίβισκος* and a Dacian town *Τίρισκον*. The question is: How did the varying Indo-European accent come to be fixed in the Greek words in *ῖσκος*, and how did Greek get its tendency toward the accentuations *-ῖου* and *ῖου* in the substantives in *ῖον*? Professor Postgate has not provided a satisfactory answer. As to the etymology and accent of the suffix *ῖσκος*, I would refer to Walter Petersen's *The Greek Diminutive Suffix -ῖσκο- -ῖσκη-*, which was published in *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XVIII. (1913), pp. 141-207 (especially pp. 143-150), one of the few important works to escape Professor Postgate's attention.

In other words to which 'Wheeler's law' has been applied our author thinks either that the paroxytonesis is original or that it is due to a tendency toward retraction of the accent by one mora, whether the word ended in a dactyl or not. No doubt 'Wheeler's law' does not deserve the name, but as far as I can see we must admit a tendency in that direction. If we disagree with Professor Postgate and class as long for purposes of accent the antepenult of such words as *θηλυκτόνος* and *λογογράφος*, the tendency is very striking indeed. As a matter of fact such syllables were probably as long as any in the prehistoric period when the tendency in question was operative. However, I agree with Professor Postgate that we need more light before we can get to the bottom of this matter.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

ARETAEUS AND GALEN.

- (1) *Aretaeus*. Edidit CAROLUS HUDE.
 (2) *Galenus De sanitate tuenda, De alimentorum facultatibus, De bonis malisque siccis, De victu attenuante, De ptisana*. Ediderunt F. KONRADUS KOCH, GEORGIUS HELMREICH, CAROLUS KALBFLEISCH, OTTO HARTLICH. *Aretaeus*, pp. xxv+183; *Galenus*, pp. lxxiii+522. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1923.

THE money raised for the *Corpus Medicorum Graecorum* was lost during the financial crisis that followed the War, but it is pleasing to note that means are being found to bring out a few of the volumes that were originally planned. Both the works under review are, from the point of view of the textual critic, exhaustive, and subsequent research is left with very little to glean. It is therefore a pity that the paper used is so poor that it can scarcely last many years in a satisfactory condition.

The volume of Galen, carefully edited with every scrap of information necessary for the construction of the text, contains several works dealing with the question of diet in health and in disease. The elaborate care with which the ancient medical writers discussed food-values makes such works as *De sanitate tuenda* of great interest to all scholars, who will find that it throws much light upon many difficult questions of ancient life and thought.

The work of Aretaeus is not so inter-

esting to the general scholar, but it will appeal to every medical man because of its clear and systematic discussion of diseases and their cures. The editor is to be heartily congratulated for his courage in dealing with the difficult points of dialect that present themselves in the history of medical Ionic. Nobody seems to know why Ionic continued to be used down to such a late date—Aretaeus and Galen were almost contemporaries—or what forms medical Ionic did, or did not, admit. It is plain, however, from a critical study of the manuscripts, that the later medical writers, including some of those whose works appear in the *Corpus Hippocraticum*, used constructions which a strict grammarian would regard as barbarous. Hude's preface (pp. viii-xxiii) contains a most illuminating account of these peculiarities. They include $\eta\nu$ with indicative; $\eta\nu$ with optative; subjunctive and $\alpha\nu$ in a potential sense; optative in primary sequence; optative for imperative; optative without $\alpha\nu$ in a potential sense. I may add that the last is to be frequently found in many works of the Hippocratic *Corpus*, including the earlier ones.

It is to be hoped that the other volumes of this wonderful series will not be long delayed. The need for a satisfactory text of Hippocrates is especially pressing.

W. H. S. JONES.

SOME TRANSLATIONS.

- The *Antigone* of Sophocles, translated by R. C. TREVELYAN. London: Hodder and Stoughton. 3s. 6d. net.
 The *Helen* of Euripides, translated by J. T. SHEPPARD. Cambridge: University Press. 2s. net.
 A Few Words on Verse Translation from Latin Poets, by W. E. HEITLAND. Cambridge: University Press. 2s. 6d. net.
 Catullus, translated by SIR WILLIAM MARRIS, with the Latin Text. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 5s. net.
 The Loves of Dido and Aeneas, being the Fourth Book of the *Aeneid*, translated

- into English Verse by RICHARD FANSHAWE, edited, with notes, by A. L. IRVINE. Oxford: Blackwell. 6s. net.
 The *Aeneid* of Virgil in English Verse, Vol. II., Books IV.-VI., by A. S. WAY. London: Macmillan. 5s. net.
 Martial's *Epigrams*, Translations and Imitations, by A. L. FRANCIS and H. F. TATUM. Cambridge: University Press. 7s. 6d. net.
 MR. SHEPPARD and Mr. Trevelyan continue their excellent translations of the Greek drama on lines already familiar to many readers and spectators. Mr.

Sheppard favours the extensive use of rhyme in all parts of the play, with a variety of metres in the lyrical portions. Mr. Trevelyan never resorts to rhyme, and seeks to reproduce in the lyrical parts the rhythmical phrasing and pattern of the original Greek. Whether severe 'Attic' plainness can in this way be effectively copied in another language, to what extent one can transfer unfamiliar metres successfully from the Classical tongues to our own, are matters of controversy on which the last word will never be said; but Mr. Trevelyan's experiment was well worth making, if only to convince some Greekless readers that a chorus from the *Antigone* is different from the facile numbers of a comic opera. One is conscious throughout that Mr. Trevelyan's work is a translation; Mr. Sheppard is smoother, more natural, rather more vigorous. On p. 25 of the *Helen* the following lines seem unfortunate:

Fly, fly, for fear—
For fear—it makes no difference—far or near,
She knows that you are here! Oh dear! oh dear!

Surely there is nothing in the Greek or the situation to warrant all this jingle.

The *opusculum* from Mr. Heitland's pen deals very admirably with some aspects of verse translation. How far, for example, Conington was justified in following the Scott model in his rendering of the *Aeneid*; how necessary are affinity and sympathy between author and translator; why Dryden's rhymed couplet is the natural vehicle for the rapid, antithetical style of much of the *Pharsalia*, but entirely unsuitable for Lucretius. Mr. Heitland adds greatly to his readers' debt by his own translations from Lucan (in rhymed couplets), and (in blank verse) of the noble passage in which Lucretius rises to the height of his message. There is no more suggestive discussion of the theory of verse translation—brief though it be—and there are no more inspiring or instructive models for the student than are to be found in this slight but far from negligible volume.

Sir William Marris's translation of Catullus is scholarly, straightforward,

forcible. One may apply to it Mr. Heitland's words regarding a certain version of Horace: 'If it loses by not smacking of the Professor, it surely gains by sympathy and ease.' In Catullus the *manus extrema* counts much; and there is something a little rough, owing doubtless to the exigencies of the rhyme, in such expressions as

Death's sombre wings,
That swallow up all pretty things
(III. 13-14).

Dear Sabine or Tiburtine clods
(XLIV. 1).

a drumming hymn
Beats in my ears
(LI. 10-11).

Still, the book will take a worthy place among verse translations.

Sir Richard Fanshawe, Milton's successor as Latin Secretary, in 1648 published a translation in the Spenserian stanza of the Fourth Book of the *Aeneid*, of which Mr. Irvine presents an edition (among Blackwell's series of Virgilian Studies) with most sensible notes. It would certainly be a pity if so commendable a work as Fanshawe's should be unknown to the modern student.

The other Virgil volume is by Dr. Way, who indefatigably, irresistibly pursues his course through the Greek and Latin Classics, our official and authorised translator. No one can be blind to the merits of Dr. Way's work, its closeness to the original, its high standard of scholarship and poetic quality. In this rendering of *Aeneid* IV.-VI. there is one distressing blemish, surely due to some fatality in the proof-reading:

Let thou and I o'er her people in unison reign
(IV. 102).

And the metre is very heavy: 'six-foot anapaest with the usual allowance of iambic substitution and of anacrustic beginning'—the metre with which Tennyson's *Maud* opens. It can give us long lines like VI. 281,

Whose locks, which are crawling adders, with
blood-dripping bands are uptied,

and such short difficult lines as VI. 293,
Are but unsubstantial disembodied existences.
'Oh for an hour of Calverley!' is the exclamation that will rise to many a

lip. Is it sheer perversity that makes
Dr. Way translate the rapid

Idem omnis simul ardor habet, rapiuntque
ruuntque (IV. 581)

by a slow line—

With fiery energy one and all ply foot and hand,
and

Adnixi torquent spumas, et caerula uerrunt
(IV. 583)

by

They are sweeping the blue waves, whirling the
spray, as they strain with their might—?

Were the vessels in question racing
eight-oar boats? and is Virgil's 'auditory
imagination' not to be trusted?

Last of all comes Martial, from whom
Messrs. Francis and Tatum here offer

a selection of translations and imitations which merits great praise.

Bad wife, bad husband, like as pea to pea,
I really wonder that you can't agree.

Could there be any better rendering than this of VIII. 35? And there is very deft handling of proper names, e.g. in I. 61. The text is old-fashioned, being (with the numbering) that of Paley. The translators add sporadic notes and headings where Martial's meaning is not obvious. At times one would welcome more of such aid, or a slightly longer but clearer translation, for an epigram's prosperity rests on the immediate impression.

R. G. NISBET.

THE WARBURG LIBRARY.

Bibliothek Warburg: Vorträge, 1921-1922. Pp. 185, with 11 Plates. *Vorträge*, 1922-1923, I. Teil. Pp. 239, with 16 Plates. 8vo. Both edited by FRITZ SAXL. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923, 1924.

Studien der Bibliothek Warburg: Die Begriffsform im Mythischen Denken. By ERNST CASSIRER. 8vo. Pp. 62. Leipzig: Teubner, 1922. *Dürers 'Melencolia I.': eine Quellen- und Typen-geschichtliche Untersuchung*. By ERWIN PANOFSKY and FRITZ SAXL. Large 8vo. Pp. xv+160, with 45 Plates. Leipzig: Teubner, 1923. *'Idea': ein Beitrag zur Begriffsgeschichte der Aelteren Kunsttheorie*. By ERWIN PANOFSKY. Large 8vo. Pp. 145, with illustrations. Leipzig: Teubner, 1924. *Sprache und Mythos: ein Beitrag zum Problem der Götternamen*. By ERNST CASSIRER. Large 8vo. Pp. 87. Leipzig: Teubner, 1925.

THE aim of the Warburg Library and of its lectures and publications is to provide material for the study of the continuous life of classical motives and ideas in the civilisations which have flourished later on the shores of the Mediterranean, and this especially in the spheres of fine art and religion. In these volumes we have some of the

chief fruits of the institution during the few years of its existence: charmingly illustrated volumes and yet not expensive, containing series of lectures, mostly on the history of art, and special studies of which the most elaborate is the history of the notion of 'melancholy' and its representation in art which bears the name of Dürer's well-known plate as title. In the nature of the case the Warburg publications are likely to interest a variety of specialists who do not commonly find themselves side by side, and who certainly do not meet in the pages of the C.R. Thus the *Melencolia* study contains text and translation of a long passage in Aristotle's *Problems*. Among the lectures, classical students might be glad to have their attention called to the following—'Eidos und Eidolon,' a general statement of Plato's attitude to art (Cassirer), 'Augustin als antiker und als mittelalterlicher Mensch' (Reitzenstein). Panofsky's *Idea*, intended as a sequel to Cassirer's lecture above mentioned, gives a clear and interesting account of the variations through the centuries in the use (and abuse) of this Platonic term in connexion with fine art. The care with which the volumes have been produced and the illustrations selected deserves the highest praise.

J. L. STOCKS.

THE ANNALS OF ENNIUS.

The Annals of Ennius. Edited by
ETHEL MARY STEUART. One vol. Pp.
246. London: Cambridge University
Press, 1925. 7s. 6d. net.

THIS edition is the first attempt in English to present, with complete critical and explanatory notes, the whole of the extant genuine or attributed fragments of the *Annals* of Ennius. It may be said at the outset that a very difficult task has been admirably performed. The fragments are arranged in the order of the books of the *Annals*, and their particular position in each book, to which they appear, either on authority or on grounds of probable conjecture, to belong: the allocation of many fragments is, of course, uncertain, but wherever Miss Steuart differs from a generally accepted view, she supports her conclusion by evidence and argument. The critical notes, which consist of full quotation of the source of each fragment, with MS. and other variants, are very sensibly printed, in smaller type, in the body of the text, attached to the fragment to which they refer. Some of the MS. variants might have been omitted with advantage: e.g. Bk. VIII. fr. 2 is quoted by Gellius, twice by Cicero, once by Lactantius, so that no useful purpose seems to be served by recording that for 'amatur' in l. 3 one MS. of Gellius has 'amit': again at Bk. VII. fr. 20 Servius is quoted (*ad Geo.* II. 449), 'longique cupressi stant rectis folii set amaro corpore buxum'; the critical note has 'rectis' (Ursinus), 'amaro' (Ursinus), of which the latter simply bewilders the reader.

Of fragments of doubtful interpretation the most interesting is the passage, quoted by Cicero in the *Brutus*, in which Ennius gives his reason for not describing the First Punic War:

scripsere alii rem
versibus quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant,
quom neque Musarum scopulos quisquam su-
perarat
nec dicti studiosus erat.

So our texts of Cicero give it, but 'superarat' appears to be of doubtful authenticity. If the reading is correct, the interpretation is clear, 'when as yet

no one had climbed the peaks of the Muses.' Miss Steuart is not satisfied with this: she quarrels with the interpretation of 'scopulos,' which, she says, may describe part of a hill, but cannot mean the whole of it. She interprets 'scopulos' as 'rocks' in the sense of 'difficulties' or 'dangers,' dissociating it from 'Musarum,' which she says must depend on some lost word (e.g. 'auxilio'), and rejecting 'superarat.' L. and S., oddly enough, quote 'Musarum scopulos' from this passage to illustrate the meaning 'difficulties,' but the interpretation 'poetical difficulties' is one which will recommend itself to few; in any case 'scopuli' of the kind that led to the metaphor are not got over by 'climbing' but by steering. But in view of Ovid's 'Mavortis scopulus' for the Areopagus, and the fact that Parnassus had two conspicuous peaks, it does not appear at all impossible to interpret 'Musarum scopulos' as 'the Mountain of the Muses': Cicero's quotation gives 'Musarum scopulos,' with no place in the line for a missing word for 'Musarum' to depend on.

This same fragment is made the text for a long and closely reasoned excursus (No. II., p. 163) on the existence at Rome of a school of native ballad poetry. Beginning with Charisius' (fourth century A.D.) explanation of the name 'Saturnius'—'quod Saturno defuncto apotheosis eius hac dictione sit celebrata, cuius exemplum adhuc in linteis libris reperitur,' quoting Dionysius' remark about Coriolanus, ἄδεται καὶ ὑμνεῖται, and Festus' reference to Regulus—'inter quos M. Atilius bello quod gestum est contra Poenos, ut scriptum est in carmine Saturnio,' and again Dionysius—ὡς ἐν τοῖς πατρίοις ὕμνοις ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἐστὶ καὶ νῦν ἄδεται (of the divine birth of Romulus), Miss Steuart draws the inference that Livius' choice of the Saturnian metre for his *Odyssey*, and Naevius' similar choice for his *Bellum Punicum*, point to the existence of a long and continuous tradition of the use of the Saturnian for ballad and quasi-epic poetry, in which Livius and Naevius are not pioneers but the culmination of a long

development. Further support for the argument is drawn from Varro's reference to *Carmen Priami*, Festus' and Charisius' reference to and quotations from *Carmen Nerei* (the attempt to prove these last quotations to be Saturnian in metre is not quite convincing), and Servius' statement (on *Aen.* II. 486) that the whole passage of Virgil is taken from *Albanum excidium*, which is not Servius' usual method of referring to a passage in Ennius, and it looks as if *Albanum excidium* were the title of a separate poem. The

excursus is a very able attempt to reinstate the famous theory of Niebuhr, which has for so long been discredited.

The book has no introduction: page 1 plunges us 'in medias res' with the first fragment: a second edition of so excellent a book would be improved with a short literary or historical introduction, and (a point of detail) with a tabulated list of abbreviations used in the critical notes—Serv. (D), Gell. Z., Expl. in Don. 565 K are a little daunting to the average reader.

H. WILLIAMSON.

MR. OWEN'S *TRISTIA*.

P. Ovidi Nasonis Tristium Liber Secundus. Edited, with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary. By S. G. OWEN, M.A., Student and Tutor of Christ Church, Oxford. Clarendon Press, 1924.

IN this excellent volume the Introduction is not the least excellent part. It deals with the causes of Ovid's banishment, the arrangement of Ovid's apology, the poet's attempt at an epic, the manuscripts, editions, and translations of the *Tristia*. The first chapter will naturally claim most attention, for the mystery surrounding Ovid's banishment to-day, as in the past, fascinates scholars. Mr. Owen gives in full all the passages which can throw any light on the nature of the poet's error. He discusses fully some of the most recent theories, and is himself inclined to the conclusion that Ovid's ruin was due to political rather than amatory intrigue, and that Tiberius and Livia were mainly responsible: but 'Ovid did not intend his secret to be revealed and unrevealed it must remain.' He draws attention to the ruthlessness and brutality of Augustus when his will was crossed, and our sympathy for the poet is roused still more by Dr. Gilbert Murray's fine appreciation of Ovid's unworldliness. Mr. Owen gives an interesting analysis of the argument of Ovid's defence, showing its forensic inspiration, but he points out the weakness of Ovid's pleas. As regards Ovid's unfinished *Gigantomachia*, Mr. Owen holds that the work was inter-

rupted by an express injunction of Augustus. These fine essays are a stimulating preliminary to the perusal of the poem itself.

The translation is spirited and graceful, as well as exact. On a couple of passages one may disagree with the translator. Lines 327 f.: 'tenuis mihi campus aratur: illud erat magnae fertilitatis opus' are rendered by 'I plough a field of meagre soil: the other was a labour of extensive contents.' Mr. Owen holds that 'fertilitas' does not, for Ovid, signify fertility of invention. The ordinary version 'yours is a theme which demands rich powers of poetry' seems justified by *P. IV.* 2. 11.: 'fertile pectus habes, interque Heliconae colentes uberius nulli provenit ista seges.' In 526 'and the foreign mother shows murder written in her eyes' appears to force the Latin: 'inque oculis facinus barbara mater habet.'

As regards the text Mr. Owen shows his usual conservatism. He sees no established trace of interpolated lines; Dr. Ehwald has bracketed no less than twelve lines in *Tristia* II. The departures from the Oxford edition of 1914 are as follows: 9 vitium quoque carmine *Baehrens* 166 hic *Bodl. Auct. F.* 1. 18, *vett. edd.* 175 tui es *Némethy* 281 multi quam *L* 357 voluptas *V dett.* 376 viris *codd. meliores* 472 erat *ζ* 542 praeterii totiens inrequietus *FLw.* Of these 472 'erat,' and possibly 166 'hic' are changes for the better, but one feels doubtful about the rest. Is there anything in Ovid like 'carmine' for 'dempto carmine'?

In spite of the cacophony, Mr. Owen's own suggestion 'cum carmine' is more pleasing. It is hard to understand how one so versed in Ovidian metric as the editor could have given his blessing to 'tui es' (175). The best tradition is: 'dimidioque tui praesens et respicis urbem, dimidio procul es bellaque saeva geris.' Heinsius began the series of assaults to which 175 has been subjected, though before him 'es et aspicias' was concocted by some medieval corrector. Dr. Ehwald marks the distich as an interpolation. The rock of offence is the *et*. Is it presumptuous to suggest that this *et* is analogous to the 'et' in 'Iam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna,' or, to take an example from Ovid, who has several, 'Arsit et Euphrates Babylonius, arsit Orontes' (M. 2. 248)? Surely the anaphora renders the correlative 'et' unnecessary? In his note on 281 Mr. Owen decides that 'ludi' cannot be used for 'munera' and renounces *multis*. But 'multi' is too indefinite in itself and makes 'saepe' otiose (Mr. Owen omits this word in his translation). Does not the flaw lie in 'dederunt,' and did not Ovid write 'multis quam saepe dedisti'? Ovid is similarly outspoken below, 511: 'haec tu spectasti spectandaque saepe dedisti.' Heinsius proposed 'quam munera saepe dedisti.' On 357, Minucius Felix (12. 5) is quoted in support of 'honesta voluptas,' and the passage is rendered: 'Also the book is not evidence of my character, but is a harmless diversion: you will find in it many things suited to amuse the reader.' Even thus emended and translated, line 357 seems only a feeble iteration of 353 ff. On 376 the editor reminds us that it is a mannerism of Ovid to repeat in juxtaposition the same word in a different sense. He holds that Ovid here is contrasting 'vir' 'the husband' with 'viris' 'men.' But such a contrast seems flat; it would be absurd to conceive Penelope as courted by any other creatures than men. If Ovid did write 'viris,' in this context and in its emphatic position it must mean 'heroes,' and the suitors were hardly heroes over against Ulysses. Assimilation is a very common phenomenon in MSS., and the vulgate 'procis' will still find supporters. The defence of 'inre-

quietus eques' is ingenious and gallant. A knight whom Augustus wished to degrade would be halted at the 'transvectio.' A knight who escaped this stoppage might be styled 'inquietus,' and the passage can be rendered: 'I often passed before your tribunal of transgressions, a knight without reproach.'

Turning to a few of the vexed passages, one will find certain weakness in the case for the defence. In 79 f. 'carmina ne nostris quae te venerantia libris iudicio possint candidiore legi' the construction is explained as being 'ne quae carmina,' etc. The tmesis is illustrated by Cic. *Att.* X. 12. 3 'ne quando quid emanet,' Ovid *M.* XII. 497 'inque ligatus,' XIII. 713 'praeter erant vecti.' Even if these illustrations supported the anomaly in the present line, one cannot help asking what exigency, metrical or otherwise, drove Ovid to make this arrangement when at least two unexceptionable alternatives were open to him. It is as much a mystery as the cause of his banishment. Gronovius suggested 'quoque' for 'quae,' and this change adds to the force of Ovid's plea. The lines 91 f. are translated: 'And if this brings me no advantage, and my repute for probity is irrevocably lost, still I have incurred no reproach.' Mr. Owen points out that one would expect a dative with 'redditur,' and suggests 'honestis' ('good acts'). The genitive, however, seems characteristic, cp. *A.A.* II. 390: 'gloria peccati nulla petenda sui.' In any case 'et honesti gloria nulla (?nulli) redditur' should be punctuated and translated as a parenthetical 'sententia.' Ovid loves these moral asides, often introduced by 'et,' and 'Virtue is its own reward' appears several times (see *T. V.* 14. 31, *P. II.* 3. 11 ff.). In 495 'nec' is explained as equivalent to 'ne quidem' and the translation runs: 'Indeed not even one do I see of these many writers that has been ruined by his verse; save me I find no other.' Mr. Owen has forgotten to mention *L.*'s 'unus' which one feels is right and which is implicit in his version.

The commentary is constructed on the most generous lines. It would be impossible to do justice to it in this

short review. Mr. Owen has provided what amounts to a reference library for Ovid. Every fact which might bear directly or indirectly on any possible point in the text is given in the greatest detail. Some of these notes might, perhaps, appear better in the form of appendices, or as introductory essays—a field in which Mr. Owen excels. There is occasionally an overlapping, and repetition as in the citations on 312 and 504. And sometimes space is given to considering views which the editor must know at first sight to be valueless. He

seems to suffer the eccentricities of scholars, if not gladly, at least with exemplary courtesy. He is especially patient with Mr. Hilberg. We hardly require that scholar's 'Law G' to be convinced that Ovid wrote 'quae fuerat saevi' (144) and not 'saevi quae fuerat' nor 'quae saevi fuerat': nor is 'Law K' necessary to show us that 'callida' does not qualify 'verba' in line 500.

As far as the reviewer was able to see, there are very few slips in the vast sea of references; none that he did detect were of an important character.

E. H. ALTON.

ROMAN TRADE-ROUTES AND COMMERCE.

Trade-Routes and Commerce of the Roman Empire. By M. P. CHARLESWORTH. Pp. viii + 288. Cambridge: University Press, 1924. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

THERE are perhaps now living six scholars who, after a lifetime's study, could carry out with reasonable completeness the task which Mr. Charlesworth has undertaken in this volume. At every turn the writer must face the criticism of the specialists, each of whom, while admitting that parts of the book are excellent, will bitterly complain of the sketchy and inaccurate treatment of the part of the subject in which he is immersed. Much of the material is archaeological, knowledge of which can in many points be obtained only by actually seeing and handling the objects concerned, and in some cases cannot be communicated at all by the discoverer. It might almost seem that such a subject, though of great interest in itself and consonant with modern interests and enquiries, can never obtain adequate treatment. But fortunately a work need not be complete to be useful, and rather than regret that we are not provided with what in the circumstances we have no right to expect, we may well express our gratitude for what we have received.

Mr. Charlesworth lays before us the results of careful and well-chosen, though not specialised, studies in various aspects of Roman commerce.

After a brief introductory sketch of Italy and the founding of the Empire, he devotes single chapters to Egypt,

Syria, the sea-route to India, Asia Minor, the land-route to China and India, Greece, Africa, the Northern Frontiers, Gaul, and Britain.

In a work based on such varied and scattered material errors of fact or of inference are bound to intrude. Few perhaps would agree with the eulogy of Augustus' Eastern policy (p. 11 f.): it is hardly correct to say that the three legions which Augustus left in Egypt (as many as were in Syria or Macedonia for much of his reign) were no strong force (p. 17); that a legion was withdrawn thence by Tiberius (p. 246); that the African legion was stationed at Timgad (p. 136); that there were few imperial estates in Asia Minor until the second century; that Hofheim was occupied c. A.D. 100 (p. 281); that the marble of Synnada was white. That undue optimism is shown in treating Britain more briefly than the other provinces 'because more information on the subject is readily available' is clear from the fact that at least part of what he says is based on sources out-of-date or inadequate. In reality the character of the material regarding Britain makes judgment and caution more necessary than in almost any branch of his subject.

In general, however, the points open to criticism seem to me, in view of the scope of his treatment, neither numerous nor important. Mr. Charlesworth succeeds in giving in the several chapters clear and, within their limits, well-balanced pictures of the development of ways of communication by land and water in the

different regions, the chief products and their distribution over the Empire, and the part played by the Imperial Government in organising and controlling the various activities connected with them.

Such pictures cannot fail to be useful alike to the specialist and the general student. It is, for example, a great boon to one whose interests turn rather to the western half of the Empire to have conveniently set out in a single volume coherent accounts of the land and sea routes to the Far East, of the trade relations with the Persian Gulf and the coastal districts of Arabia and East Africa, and of the products and routes of Asia Minor, the materials for

all of which are so scattered or so inaccessible that he would naturally shrink from the labour of pursuing them. In the mind of the general student they should do something to implant that most important but difficult conviction that the population of the Roman Empire consisted of real human beings with material needs and methods of satisfying them not unlike those of their descendants after fifty generations.

Mr. Charlesworth's achievement in the present volume prompts the wish that he may expand the material of each of his eleven chapters into a volume, and that we may live to read them.

D. ATKINSON.

THE FOUNDING OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

The Founding of the Roman Empire.

F. B. MARSH, Ph.D. Pp. 329. University of Texas Studies. University of Texas Press, 1922.

MR. MARSH undertakes in the space of 300 pages to sketch the events, and from them to infer the causes, which led to the collapse of the Republican government and the foundation of the Principate. Plainly in both tasks a rigorous selection of material is necessary, and to discuss in detail any aspect of the problems involved must lead to a loss of proportion. In general, Mr. Marsh has been successful in avoiding such pitfalls, the points which he emphasises are for the most part those of the greatest importance—the predominance of the military factor produced by the army reforms of Marius, the consequent struggle for the extended provincial commands which gave control of military force, and the powerlessness of the central government against the wielders of it. He lays proper stress on the importance of the career of Pompey, and follows Meyer in showing how it was this, rather than the position which Caesar was in course of providing for himself, which provided for the model for the organisation set up by Augustus. The book consists of nine chapters, of which the first two sketch the development of the government of the Empire during the second and early first centuries B.C. and of the

military system in the same period, the next five the course of events from the rise of Pompey to the final triumph of Octavian, the last two the organisation of the Principate. The five middle chapters give an adequate, well-balanced, and pleasantly written account of the period they cover, based on a good knowledge of recent research, and the discussion of the political aims of Antony and Cleopatra, which reduces to its proper insignificance the anecdotal tradition which dominated the narrative of historians of the last century, is worthy of special commendation.

The first two and the last two chapters are less satisfactory. In both sections Mr. Marsh has developed an ingenious theory based on detailed genealogical studies. The curious vacillation in foreign policy during the second century B.C. is explained by a calculation of the number of curule families available for office; the discovery about 150 B.C. of the possibilities of the pro-magistracy permitted the outburst of provincial expansion during the next thirty years. This expansion exhausted the new resources and there was a return to the old conservative policy. These considerations no doubt had weight, but in the space at Mr. Marsh's disposal it is impossible to put them in their proper proportion, with the result that the influence of the rise of the capitalist class is almost

wholly omitted. Similarly on the presence or absence of members of aristocratic and 'new' families in the 'fasti' under Augustus is chiefly based the discussion of Augustus' general policy at different times in his Principate. Here again the point is original and ingenious, and the appendices in which the 'fasti' are analysed contain most useful

matter; but the students for whom the book is presumably intended would need to be warned that other considerations of at least equal importance receive little or no attention. But with these cautions the book may be safely recommended as a useful and reliable guide to what is after all the most important of all periods of ancient history.

D. ATKINSON.

THE PRINCEPS' JURISDICTION IN ROME.

The Rise of the Princeps' Jurisdiction within the City of Rome. BY DONALD MCFAYDEN. Reprinted from Washington University Studies, Vol. X., Humanistic Series, No. 2, Pp. 181 + 264. 1923.

PROFESSOR MCFAYDEN'S work is the third of his studies in the constitutional development of the Principate.¹ All three represent a reaction against the formalist views developed by Mommsen and his school, who attempt to show that by offices and powers legally conferred upon them Augustus and his successors possessed a supreme constitutional authority over all departments of the government. In Professor McFayden's opinion not only were such powers not conferred on them by definite enactments either of Senate or Assembly, but in many cases were not even exercised *de facto* by the earliest Principes. Thus he denies that Augustus was granted *maius imperium* over the senatorial proconsuls, or that the *proconsulare imperium* was extended to cover the city of Rome. In the present work he deals with the view of Mommsen that Augustus introduced two radical innovations into Roman judicial procedure in setting up two supreme jurisdictions, that of the Consuls and Senate on the one hand, that on the Princeps on the other. He fails to find any undoubted case of the exercise of such jurisdiction by Augustus or Tiberius, or

any constitutional basis on which it could rest, and maintains that the hearing of cases by the Senate did not, strictly speaking, transform it into a court of justice. As under the Republic—e.g. in the case of the Catilinarians—it dealt with an accused person not as a law breaker but as a public menace.

The character of the Roman constitution, full as it was of legal fictions and customary rights, makes the solution of such problems extremely difficult. It is probable that Mommsen and his school have, through a desire for lucidity, carried formalism too far; but it is doubtful whether Mr. McFayden succeeds in proving his case, which can only be done by throwing over the testimony of Dio, Suetonius, and Tacitus in some details and giving their words a non-natural interpretation in others.

But if the main thesis does not win complete acceptance, the work is none the less of considerable value. It contains a brief but clear and adequate account of the growth of Republican judicial procedure, civil and criminal, and an excellent sketch of the scope and character of the *Leges Iuliae iudicariae* substantiated by requisite references, which students of the early Principate will be very glad to have in English.

The type-setting perhaps hardly reaches a standard worthy of a University publication. Palmary emendations of *coercito* (p. 193), *Vuaestro* (note 131), *exceptionably* (p. 199), are not hard to make, but Vorhesi = Borghesi (note 250) might perhaps cause a little difficulty.

D. ATKINSON.

¹ The earlier ones are—*The History of the Title Imperator* (Chicago, 1920), and *The Princeps and the Senatorial Provinces* (Classical Philology, Vol. XVI., 1921).

ROMAN CIVIL PROCEDURE.

Institutionen des Römischen Zivilprozess-rechts. By L. WENGER. Pp. xi + 356.

Munich: Max Hueber, 1925. 10 Marks.

THE last half of the nineteenth century produced no new treatise on Roman civil procedure (though Keller's wonderful little book was re-edited with important revision by Wach); but so much work has been done on the fundamental notions of the *formula* (e.g. by Wlassak, to whom the present work is dedicated), and the papyri have thrown so much light on the later procedure, that the time seems ripe for a restatement of the whole matter embodying the results as yet obtained. Several such works have recently appeared: the latest is the work before us by a very distinguished Munich Romanist, who has himself largely contributed to the knowledge he is now stating. The book covers the whole ground—*legis actio*, *formula*, and *cognitio*—but most space is given to the *formula*. And, indeed, historically important as the *cognitio* is, as the stepping-stone to later procedure, most readers will agree that the *formula* has more intrinsic interest. But, in relation to the other systems, nothing important is omitted.

Such a book must contain much that is not new, but it is far from a mere statement of accepted doctrine. All that a brief review can do is to indicate some noteworthy conclusions of the author.

Iudicium, says the author (pp. 21, 181) following Wlassak, means many things, but not 'hearing before the *iudex*,' for which the usual expression is *apud iudicem*. The last proposition is fully proved, and in view of the ambiguity of the word *iudicium* is not surprising. But does this word never mean the actual hearing? What else can it mean in Cicero, *Part. Or.* 28. 99, where the discussion in *iure* is *ante iudicium*, the transfer to the *iudex* is *in iudicium venire*, and the discussions before the *iudex* are *in iudicio*?

The author takes the view that the duplex procedure as we know it is not primitive, that the *rex* was judge. It is a difficult question, but evolution from a system under which the State assumes the responsibility of judging private

disputes to one in which it does hardly more than 'keep the ring' is not *a priori* easy to accept.

Pp. 28-75 give an illuminating account of jurisdiction, the proper forum, etc. We are told that in the *cognitio* system the hearing was always open to the public. But the evidence is consistent with a growing tendency to trial in private. C. 11. 6. 5. *pr.* deals with a special type of case, and the natural inference is that there was no such general rule. Bethmann-Hollweg's texts (*Civilprozess*, 3, 189) seem conclusive for Justinian.

On p. 92 is a very interesting note on *vindex* as a substitute for immediate obedience to *in ius vocatio*, and on p. 102 there is a very informing analysis of the courses open to the defendant in a *legis actio*. The author holds, with others, that *confessio in iure* in a real action was followed by *addictio*. The inference from *cessio in iure* is hardly conclusive.

On p. 144 the author takes the view that *praescriptio pro reo* did not, if proved, operate like an *exceptio*: the right of action was not consumed. On p. 148 he reiterates his view that even in classical law an *exceptio* might have the effect of reducing the *condemnatio*.

On pp. 190 ff. the author discusses the circumstances in which an oath was possible *apud iudicem*, and its effects. He concludes that the *iudex privatus* had no power to administer an oath to a party or to vary the amount sworn to in the *iusiurandum in litem* in an action with the *arbitrium* clause.

On pp. 207 ff. there is an excellent but too brief discussion of the negative effects of judgment (exclusion of further action) and the positive (establishment of the fact as between the parties), and of the extent to which a judgment could affect persons not actual parties.

On p. 223 the view is expressed that it was usual for a successful claimant, if the judgment was not satisfied, to proceed both by *bonorum venditio* and by personal seizure.

P. 237 provides an interesting consideration of the essential nature of interdicts and their difference from the ordinary judicial process.

On p. 251 the author lays it down that in the transitional period, in which the case was still tried by *formula*, but before a *iudex datus*, the statement of the issue still has the character, lost in the later system, of a procedural contract between the parties.

On p. 272 it is maintained that the procedure in *contumaciam* was available against the plaintiff as well as against the defendant. On p. 274 the effect of *confessio* in the *cognitio* is considered and the view reached that at least *confessio certi*, or in *vindicatio*, dispensed with need of judgment—a matter which the state of the texts makes very puzzling.

That in classical law the *actio iudicati*, even where it proceeded to a *iudicium*, might in some cases lead to a *condemnatio*

only in *simplum* (p. 220), and that the *actio iudicati* was still needed as a preliminary to execution in Justinian's law (p. 301), are theses for the demonstration of which the author refers to his earlier *Actio Iudicati*.

On pp. 307 *sqq.* is a discussion of the obscure procedure by rescript, and on p. 333 an account, which might well have been longer, of the rather neglected ecclesiastical jurisdictions.

Not all Professor Wenger's conclusions will be universally accepted: indeed, many of them have been and are the subject of acute controversy. But the book is to be warmly recommended, both to teachers and to their pupils, as a model exposition of a difficult and important subject.

W. W. BUCKLAND.

CHARISIUS.

Flavii Sosipatri Charisii Artis Grammaticae Libri V. Edidit CAROLUS BARWICK. Pp. xxvi+539. Leipzig: Teubner, 1925. 12 gold marks (14 gold marks, bound).

THERE is ample justification for a new edition of Charisius. Keil's edition appeared as long ago as 1857 (*Grammatici Latini*, Vol. I.), and Barwick finds reason to disagree with his classification of MSS. Further, he has recollated the chief MS., Naples IV. A 8 (written about A.D. 700 in Irish pointed script, perhaps in Bobbio), and has discovered a considerable number of errors in Keil's reports. He finds that Naples IV. A 9 is a copy of this older MS., and that the *editio princeps* derives from this copy. He has also used two authorities unknown to Keil—namely, some ninth-century Reichenau fragments at Karlsruhe, and some fragments of Book III., perhaps from the Corvey library, which turned up at the eleventh hour. Again, he attaches great importance to the relics of the lost MS. employed by Cauchius, which supplies some *lacunae* in N. This edition is thus the first to contain the whole of Charisius.

Charisius is one of the most important of the Latin grammarians, much of this importance being derived from the quotations he makes from old and

classical writers. It is curious that Lucan is quoted only once, and that the passage cannot be identified. There is no reference to either of the Senecas. It is true that post-Augustan writers receive little attention, with the exception of the Elder Pliny. It may be mentioned, though Barwick has not, I think, found occasion to refer to the matter, that the name of Charisius never found a place in Jerome's *Chronicle*. Dr. Fotheringham's recent edition of the *Chronicle* shows that the MS. authority is overwhelming for 'Chrestus.' There is other evidence, however, which shows Charisius to have flourished in the fourth century.

On page iv, note 1, correct 'M. W. Lindsay' to 'W. M. Lindsay': it is premature and hazardous to assign an Irish origin to a number of the peculiar spellings of N (p. xxiii), and there are two forms that Barwick does not appear to understand—namely, *diffinitione* and *synlempsis*. The first of these is not a mere case of *di* for *de*, and a reduplication of a consonant, but a really different view of the origin of the word, taking it from *dis* rather than *de*. The second is not a substitution of *m* for *p*, but an euphonic spelling of *synlempsis*, which is a transliteration of the late Greek form σύνληψις (see Thackeray, *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*,

Vol. I., Cambridge, 1909, pp. 108 ff.; Winer-Schmiedel, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*, Göttingen, 1894, p. 64; Moulton-Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, London, 1920, p. 369). On the same page, for 'G. Hellmann,' read 'S. Hellmann.' It is strange to see (p. xxvi) Nonius quoted from Mercier and Pauli Festus

from Müller, though Lindsay's better editions have appeared in the same *Bibliotheca Teubneriana* as the present work. There is a misprint in the heading of p. 450, and I cannot understand on what principle the superior spelling of the Naples MS. *Heliopolis* is deserted for *Heliopolis* (p. 45, line 15). The edition deserves a hearty welcome.

A. SOUTER.

CLASSICAL QUOTATIONS IN MEDIEVAL GLOSSARIES.

Quotations from Classical Authors in Medieval Latin Glossaries. Collected and annotated by JAMES FREDERICK MOUNTFORD. Pp. 132. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXI.) New York and London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1925. \$1.50.

CONTRIBUTIONS to the *Classical Quarterly*, *Bulletin Ducange* and other periodicals have shown Professor Mountford to be one of the most active investigators in the field of Latin glossology. The present work has grown out of his collaboration with Professor Lindsay and others in the preparation of an edition of the *Liber Glossarum*, which ought shortly to see the light. His purpose, to use his own words, is (a) 'to collect in a convenient form the more important citations from classical authors preserved in medieval Latin glossaries; (b) to demonstrate as far as is possible the value and source of these interesting items; (c) to illustrate in a selected group of items the relations between the MSS. of the *Liber Glossarum* rather more fully than was possible in the edition of the whole work.'

The items which are traced to their sources in this work are those presumably taken from copies of the authors cited, or from ancient grammatical works, and not those taken at second hand from a source like Isidore's *Etymologiae*. Such items not only shed light on the school education of medieval times, but also give occasional help in classifying MSS. of classical authors and restoring the text of these authors. The task of investigation is, therefore, one of real interest and importance.

An introduction as lucid as it is

valuable explains the present state of knowledge on the complicated questions involved in the study of such glossaries as 'Abstrusa,' and must not be neglected by any student of Latin glossaries. The contention that most of the quotations from other authors come from Virgil scholia may be regarded as proved. The possibility remains open that some Lucan and Statius quotations come from Lucan scholia and Statius scholia respectively. In this connexion it might be mentioned that our oldest extant Lucan MS. belonged to Echternach, and our oldest extant MS. of Statius' *Thebais* to Corbie—facts which suggest that these authors were accessible in Northern France in the eighth century, in copies no longer extant.

The items are discussed with admirable learning. One is surprised to find the spelling 'Ptolemaei' (No. 93) for the usual Latin spelling 'Ptolomaei': is this a slip of the editor? Can No. 95 have any connexion with Hor. *Sat.* I. 5, 48-9? At No. 109 add the appropriate reference to Lindsay's *Notae Latinae* for the rare contraction 'uera.' At No. 112 the MS. tradition shows that 'cluacum' should have been put in the text; this spelling is given, for example, by the best MSS. of Augustine, *Contra Faustum*, 20, 10 (p. 548, l. 6, ed. Zycha). As regards the reference to Charisius (No. 124), it might be mentioned that Charisius does not actually assign the words to Sallust. Under several of the Statius items the variant 'stant' is widely found in glossarial MSS.: this fact suggests that in the archetype the contracted forms of authors had a horizontal line above

them, thus—'STAT'.¹ It is also notable that all the Statius *Thebais* items come from the ninth and later books. At No. 187, I should take 'istic' in the late sense (= 'hic'), meaning no doubt, as Dr. Mountford suggests, some country other than Italy (France? Spain?). On

¹ As in the compilations of Zmaragdus and Sedulius Scottus, two ninth-century writers.

L' *'Inverno' Esiodeo e le Opere e i Giorni*. ERNESTO DE FRANCO. Pp. 39. Catania: V. Muglia. 4 L.

THIS is one of those brochures with which Italian scholars, by picturesque if somewhat inconvenient custom, salute the weddings of their friends. It contains a translation of *W. D.* 493-560, some sensible criticisms of Evelyn-White's dismemberment of that passage (*C. R.* XXX., p. 209 ff.), and an enthusiastic defence of the whole as characteristically Hesiodic.

A. S. F. GOW.

Platon. Oeuvres complètes, Tome X.: *Timée, Critias*. Texte établi et traduit par ALBERT RIVAUD. Pp. cxxiii + 209; xxiii + 42. Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres', 1925. 20 frs.

THE most notable thing about this tenth volume of the excellent French translation of Plato is the lengthy introduction with which M. Rivaud (Professor in the University of Poitiers) has thought fit to furnish it. Some doubt may be felt, on a mere numeration, whether it is quite suitable to the character of this series to offer an introduction which covers more pages than the translation; but the *Timaeus* is such an exceptional work, and is so puzzling both in its general intention and in many of its details, that a satisfactory explanation of the whole of the great phantasmagoria that it presents can only be achieved with a generous allowance of space. And M. Rivaud has made excellent use of his allowance. He is concise and clear, and takes a definite line on each disputed point, even when he can do no more than hazard a modest suggestion; and his easy, attractive style sustains the reader's interest throughout. Special mention may be made of his discussion of the mythical element in the *Timaeus* (pp. 12 ff.); his refusal to regard Timaeus himself as a Pythagorean (p. 18), or this dialogue as in any real sense either 'Pythagorean' or a sequel to the *Republic* (p. 19); his belief that Plato invented the story of Atlantis (p. 31); his note of unsolved difficulties in the theory of ideas (p. 35), and of the nature of Plato's metaphysics (p. 38); his elaborate mathematical treatment of the world-soul (pp. 42 ff.); his arguments for *ελλομένην*, and against *ἀλλομένην*, in 40 B (pp. 60-2); and his account of Plato's biology (pp. 98 ff.) and pathology (pp. 110 ff.).

The primary aim of the translation is to make everything as definite as possible, and as this does not appear to have been always the primary

No. 249 the use of the misleading term 'Itale' is to be deprecated: substitute 'Old-Latin,' 'Pre-Vulgate,' or 'Non-Vulgate.'

A word of praise is due to the accuracy and beauty of the printing (a misprint on p. 23), as well as to the superior paper.

A. SOUTER.

aim of Plato, this version is 'falsely true' to the extent of being rather longer, because more explanatory, than the original; it lacks also the truth attained by the noble diction and rhythm of Archer-Hind. But the modern student will be very grateful for the constant help that it gives him.

The *Critias* is introduced with interesting discussions of the legendary genealogies (pp. 234 ff.), the pictures given of ancient Attica and of Atlantis (pp. 239 ff.), the rituals of the sacrifice and the oath (pp. 244 ff.), and the probable sources from which Plato drew his material (pp. 246 ff.). The text of both dialogues is conservative, and is equipped with an ample apparatus.

W. R. M. LAMB.

Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der ersten Ptolemäer auf Grund der Papyri. By ERNST MEYER. One vol. Pp. viii + 90. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1925. 6 gold Marks.

THIS book, an outcome of the Zeno papyri, represents much labour, and is valuable for its full collection of material (with index) and for the detailed chronological tables which summarise the author's results; the question is, how far those results can be accepted. The foundation of Dr. Meyer's chronological scheme is, that there was only one official calendar year—the king's regnal year—reckoned in Macedonian fashion from the day of his accession, and that in every document a year given simply by a number without qualification means the regnal year. (He admits also an arbitrary financial year for Government business beginning 1 Mechir.) He then adopts Ferrabino's hypothesis that the year 'of the Egyptians' is only the Macedonian name for the Egyptian year beginning 1 Thoth, and the year 'as the revenues' the Egyptian name for the Macedonian regnal year, and he proves that these two years cannot be identical; but he has not seen that it follows from Ferrabino's view that you sometimes cannot say whether a year given without qualification be the regnal or the Egyptian year, and that in adopting it he apparently cuts away his own foundation.

By means of this single calendar year and a mass of double datings Meyer correlates the Macedonian and Egyptian calendars day by day throughout the third century; whether such detail is yet practicable may be doubted, though I note that 1 Artemisios of Philopator's sixth Egyptian year (216), now known from the recently-published official priestly decree con-

cerning Raphia to be 1 Phaophi, appears as 14 Phaophi, not a great discrepancy. But the earlier part of the list is thrown out of gear by what seems to be a mistaken theory on the cardinal point of Euergetes' accession, which Meyer makes 27 (or 28) Loos instead of 25 Dios (Canopus decree). Most of the evidence suits either day; but while two datings—*Pap. Hamburg* 24 and *Pap. Edgar* 56—imperatively demand 25 Dios, 27 Loos depends (p. 19) solely on the assumption that a legal delay of sixteen months is incredible. He explains the two dates by making Euergetes joint king with Philadelphus for over a year, finally succeeding as sole king on 25 Dios of 39 Philadelphus = 27 January 245. But no trace of such a joint kingship remains, and Meyer admits that Euergetes' Egyptian years know nothing of it; he was driven to postulate it because he is a year late with all Philadelphus' Julian dates—i.e., Philadelphus becomes co-regent in 284, and Soter dies in 282, Arsinoe in 269, and Philadelphus in 245. Very clear proof of this would be necessary, and is not forthcoming; on the contrary, Meyer has to admit (p. 57) that the year beginning 1 Thoth 282, which ought on his showing to be Philadelphus' second Egyptian year, was in fact his third; while the long argument from the Alexandrian Ptolemaieia, on which he lays much stress—that because it was a penteteris the first celebration *must* fall four years after Soter's death, which was therefore in 282—is I fear misconceived.

He concludes with a chapter criticising Beloch's recent discovery (*Arch. für Papyrusf.* VII. 161) that the Macedonian calendar as arranged by Edgar agrees with the moon. If I am right, part of this criticism falls to the ground; but that dealing with the last third of the third century will have to be considered, especially Beloch's dating of Philopator's accession in August (221). It may be that the form this question will assume is, exactly when did the Macedonian calendar in Egypt cease to go with the moon?

W. W. TARN.

Plutarchi Moralia rec. et emend. W. R. PATON et I. WEGEHAUPT One vol. Pp. xlvii + 354. Leipzig: Teubner, 1925. Paper. Mks. 10.

A MELANCHOLY interest attaches to this first volume of the new Teubner *Plutarch*, inasmuch as neither of its two editors lived to see its publication, and it is dedicated to their memory by the surviving editors; and of these Mr. M. Pohlenz, assisted by Mr. W. Sieveking, has completed and supervised the issue of the present work. Of the fourteen treatises which this volume contains all but two are edited by Paton or from his notes; for, as Mr. Pohlenz tells us in his Preface, after Paton's untimely death in April, 1921, 'uxor eius, Clio Paton, effecit ut etiam reliqui (tractatus) quos ipse praeparaverat imprimi possent. Maximam enim ei debemus gratias quod, qua est liberalitate et erga maritum pietate, ex scriniis eius omnia quae ad Plutarchi editionem pertinebant in Germaniam mittenda curavit. apparebat vero

Patonem etiam reliquorum tractatum vol. I., quos susceperat edendos, et apparatus criticum in universam perfecisse et verba Plutarchi magna ex parte ita restituisse ut non multa mutanda addenda essent; quo munere ego a Curtio Hubert adiutus functus sum.' The manuscripts and authorities for the text are fully and carefully described in the 'Praefatio,' and a double set of footnotes is printed below the text, the one giving the references for the literary sources of Plutarch's quotations or allusions, and the other consisting of notes on the text. Throughout the book it is obvious, even to one who is no expert in Plutarchean tradition, that no pains have been spared by the editors—and by Paton in special—to make the text as accurate as possible, so that it will remain not only a monument of untiring industry, but also of fine and acute scholarship.

I have noted a few places about which an *ιδιώτης* may still feel, I think, a legitimate doubt.

I. *De Lib. Educ.* 7D. τοιοῦτον (text, Paton), with footnote 'τοῦτον ὁ τὸν χειρίστον ὁ τοῦτον deleri iubet Wil(amowitz)': I suggest (after *ἀφ' αὐτοῦ*) τὸν ἀφύστατον.

II. *De Aud. Poet.* 21B. Here the second line of the quotation from Sophocles (*fr.* 85, 6) begins καὶ ἥρως τὰ βαρὰ, no mention being made of βέβηλα.

ib. 33C. ὁ μὲν εὖ μάλα κ.τ.λ.: 'locus nondum sanatus': read, perhaps, <ἐννοήσας> ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ <τῷ>... παραβάλλων (for -βαλὼν).

ib. 44B. καὶ τρέγα (Ilex Pat., μέτριον Bern.): better eject the word as incurable.

IV. 74A. ἡπρακτικὴ (προφυλακτικὴ ci. Po., προτρεπτικὴ? Wil.): ? a verbal from παράγω ('divert').

VII. 96E. ἄδολον (ἀλλοῖον ci. Po.): perhaps διλογον or ἄλογον.

ib. 95E. ἡμποοῖεν (ἐμποδὼν Pat., ἐμποδοῖεν Po.): perhaps ἐμφορεῖν.

X. 120A. φιλόσοφος (φιλόφιλος ci. Michael): ? φιλόπολις.

XIII. 148A. ἡπρός (παιδὸς Wil., παρασίτου? Po.): ? γραός.

ib. 149A τόπον <σκοπεῖν δεῖ>: one might suggest δεῖ (or χρῆ)σκ. as a likelier order.

R. G. BURY.

Achmes: Oneirocriticon. Edidit F. DREXL. Pp. xvi + 270. Leipzig: Teubner, 1925. Paper. Mks. 10.

SINCE the earliest ages of human history dreams have afforded a mine of mystery from which much gold has been dug by 'the wise men' of the nations—the magicians, the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers. Apparently no dream has as yet revealed the identity of the real author of this 'Key to Dreams,' which was first edited by N. Rigault in 1603; but Mr. Drexel shows that he must have been a Greek Christian, living between A.D. 813 and 1176, and that he was dependent upon Arab sources. The text is divided into some 300 sections, each with a heading such as 'Ἐκ τῶν Περσῶν καὶ Αἰγυπτίων περὶ καλίας, or 'Ἐκ τῶν Ἰνδῶν περὶ φυλμάτων, and dealing with all kinds of bodily features and actions, animals,

plants, and things of every sort with which dreamers are likely to be concerned. The editor appears to have done his work with much care (possibly more than the book deserves), examining all the available sources for the text and recording the variants in the footnotes. Nor is it all labour in vain; for although this *Achmes* is a compilation of the merest rubbish, a monument of human credulity, it is of some interest to philologists because of the number of Greek words it contains which are not to be found elsewhere; these are duly noted in the full 'Index rerum et verborum potiorum.'

R. G. BURY.

Die alten balkanillyrischen geographischen Namen. By HANS KRAHE. Pp. viii + 128. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1925. M. 5.

THIS book can be commended almost without reserve. It contains a very full collection of the place-names of Illyria (and of districts such as Calabria, Apulia, and Bruttium where the toponymy appears to be the same character) from Roman and Greek sources down to A.D. 600. By a careful analysis of the formative elements in the names and a classification of the stems, Dr. Krahe can claim with reasonable confidence that he has shown that his material belongs, at any rate mainly, to one linguistic type. At present that is all that can be asked for from legitimate linguistic method. Dr. Krahe, in so far as the Illyrian names are concerned, wisely refrains from etymological speculation, and so avoids the pitfalls into which most investigators in this field insist on plunging. He is less cautious, however, in dealing with a number of names alleged to be of Greek origin. Thus Damastion is explained, p. 1, as a compound of δᾶ 'earth' and μαστός 'breast.' This is phonetically possible, but to make the etymology anything better than guess-work it would be necessary to show (in the absence of certain knowledge that the name meant 'Earth-breast') that the name was given to the place by Greek speakers. As it is, the name is not entitled to an etymology. A difficulty of another kind is illustrated by the etymology suggested, p. 2, for Pylon. The name may be connected with the place-names Pylae and Pylos, and, as Dr. Krahe suggests, be identical with πυλών. But the etymology of πύλη, πυλών is entirely unknown, and it would be impossible to prove that these words were not borrowed by the Greeks from a pre-Hellenic language spoken in the Balkan peninsula. Such words may be Greek only in the sense in which 'York' is English or 'Marseilles,' French.

The Greek stem γεροντο-, p. 88, should rather be written γεροντ-.

J. FRASER.

La Méthode comparative en Linguistique historique. By A. MEILLET. Pp. viii + 116 + 4.

Oslo: H. Aschehoug and Co., 1925.

IN this work, which comprises in a slightly modified form ten lectures delivered in Oslo in connexion with the opening of the newly founded Institut for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, M. Meillet aims at defining the

conditions under which the linguist can legitimately employ the comparative method. The result is an exceedingly clear and sober introduction to the study of Comparative Philology. Much of the matter is naturally not new, but the stimulating and suggestive treatment of the subject does not suffer on that account. Attention should be called in particular to M. Meillet's repeated insistence on the necessity of caution in etymologising, of dealing with whole words and not with fragments, and of considering the meaning as well as the form. In this M. Meillet re-states principles enunciated before—e.g., by Skutsch, *Glotta* III. 285 ff.—but, if one may judge from recent comparative dictionaries and similar works, the re-statement is not superfluous. In Lecture VII., 'La Notion de Langue mixte,' M. Meillet appears to exaggerate the difficulty of admitting that a language can borrow morphological elements. Where a language has a mixed vocabulary such borrowing is inevitable. Thus, English, a Germanic language, uses the suffix *-ess*, as in *huntress*, without regard to the origin of the stem. The Irish suffix *-ic* is almost certainly borrowed from Welsh, and here the borrowing was not due to the presence in Irish of a large mass of Welsh vocabulary. In modern Eastern Armenian nominal flexion of the type N. sg. *yerk*, G. sg. *yerk-i*, N. pl. *yerk-er*, G. pl. *yerk-er-i*, is an adaptation of a non-Indogermanic morphological device. English-speakers in Cairo occasionally make the plural of *lunch* 'lunach,' an Arabic 'broken' plural; here there is a conscious break with the morphological tradition which, given favourable conditions, might easily lead to the formation of a language of English stems and Arabic flexion.

J. FRASER.

Origin of Christian Church Art. By JOSEF STRZYGOWSKI. Translated from the German by O. M. Dalton and H. J. Braunholtz. Pp. x + 267. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1923.

THE English reader of this handsome book who knows not Josef Strzygowski can have little idea how much he owes to the translators. In their preface we have a hint of the difficulty which has been experienced by a master of the subject working in collaboration with a finished German scholar in providing an English rendering of Strzygowski's German. Those of us who, with slenderer resources, have struggled with a writer whose style combines the faults and virtues of Thucydides and Carlyle, are under no illusion regarding the extent of our debt to Messrs. Dalton and Braunholtz for this lucid rendering of the mature views of the great Viennese pioneer.

The contents of the book belong mainly to a region which falls outside the scope of the *Classical Review*, but the opening chapters are of cardinal importance to students of the religious history of the Roman Empire. Strzygowski's discovery of Christian communities close to the eastern frontier of the Empire, which were tolerated, and allowed to develop architectural and artistic forms at

a time when the Church in the Roman Empire was a secret society, whose artistic expression was confined to the wall-paintings of the Catacombs, and to furtive modification of pagan sepulchral designing in surface cemeteries, opens a new chapter not only in the history of art, but in the history of the Empire. To the arguments adduced by the author for moving the ecclesiastical centre of gravity eastwards, may be added the evidence of the earliest of Christian surface gravestones. The epitaph of Avircius Marcellus, dated ca. A.D. 190, describes the wide journeyings of the Bishop of Hieropolis among the Christian communities of his time. But the only communities mentioned by name are those of Rome and *Nisibis*.

W. M. CALDER.

C. Iulius Caesar: Commentarii Belli Civilis. A. KLOTZ. Pp. 139. Editio minor. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubner, 1925.

THIS is a neat and handy little edition, consisting merely of the text with an Index nominum. The editor, who has also published a larger edition, has evidently been at pains to study the text and to adopt such readings as seem most satisfactory. As there are no notes one does not know the reasons that influenced him in his choice. Now and then he retains a very doubtful reading, such as *his expositis* III. 11¹, or *suis locis* III. 44⁸.

A. G. PESKETT.

Tibulle et les Auteurs du Corpus Tibullianum: Texte établi et traduit par MAX PONCHONT.

Pp. xli + 196 (double). Paris: Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1924. Fr. 16. THE present edition follows the plan of the series to which it belongs. The introduction embodies a doctoral thesis on the text. The author is indebted to such earlier editors as Baehrens, Hiller, Cartault, and Postgate, as well as to the re-examination of the Ambrosian and Vatican MSS. made by Calonghi, and to collations of MSS. at Brescia and Genoa made by the same scholar. He has himself also recollated the two sets of extracts in the Paris MS. and the Wolfenbüttel MS. (the latter in a photograph). He communicates also a number of conjectures made by the late Louis Havet, the idol of his fellow-countrymen. Each poem is provided with an appropriate introduction, and there are a few notes on the subject-matter.

A. SOUTER.

Renovatio Litterarum in Scholas Saec. A.C. XVI. Deducta. By T. CORCORAN. Pp. xviii + 237. Dublin: 1925.

IT was a very happy idea of Dr. Corcoran, S.J., Professor of Education in the National University of Ireland, to reprint from a large number of somewhat inaccessible works opinions on many educational questions expressed by such early scholars as Budaeus, Vives, Sadoletus, Muretus, Victorius, Longolius, Lambinus, Lipsius, Valla in the West, and certain Greek writers in the East. The topics discussed are mainly such as are important for students and teachers of the classics. The extracts are all in the original Latin, with the exception of one or two in Greek, and their interest is by no means

exclusively historical; many of them have a distinct bearing on problems of our own day.

A. SOUTER.

Die Moselgedichte des Decimus Magnus Ausonius und des Venantius Fortunatus, zum dritten Male herausgegeben und erklärt von CARL HOSIUS. Pp. 126, with 5 plates, 2 drawings in the text, and 2 maps. Marburg i. H.: Elwert, 1926. 3 gold Marks.

THE first edition of this work, a worthy production of *Lokalphilologie*, appeared in 1894, and the second in 1909. This third edition, so far as the greater part of the book is concerned, is an anastatic reprint of the second, but it contains five pages of additional notes, as well as a thorough revision of the archaeological part and of the (modern) map by Professor P. Steiner of the Provincial Museum of Trier. The notes contain *inter alia* a very full record of Ausonius's and Venantius's imitations of earlier Latin poets, as is to be expected from one who knows them like Dr. Hosius. At *Mos. 27 pronus in undas*, Lucan III. 40 might have been adduced (as at 247); with *Mos. 45 cf. Stat. silv. IV. 4, 7*; on *naiatus* (*Mos. 77*), cf. Mayor's *Latin Heptateuch*, p. 77, v. 20; *Mos. 161 tendentis in ultima cliui*, cf. Lucan IV. 147 *tendit in ultima mundi*; *Mos. 162, cf. Lucan IV. 136*; *Mos. 443 fas mihi*, cf. also *Stat. silv. II. 1, 82*, which seems to have been in Ausonius' mind, as *uenia* occurs there and in *Mos. 445*. In Venantius II. 11 *deliciosus* and 16 *ualitura* deserved notes.

At *Mos. 249* I should prefer *indutos*, believing that *inducere* is never thus used for *induere*, unless the metre requires the change from *indüere* to *inducere*. In the text of *Mos. 381 -que* has been allowed to slip out after *frugum*. The traveller in the Moselle country will find this book a delightful companion.

A. SOUTER.

Die Vita S. Hilarii Arelatensis. Eine eideographische Studie. Von BENEDIKT KOLON. Pp. 124. (Rhetorische Studien, 12. Heft.).

Paderborn: Schöningh, 1925. 8 gold Marks.

IN recent times a good deal of attention has been paid to the structure of ancient biographies like Tacitus' *Agricola* and Pontius' *Life of Cyprian*. Here we have a detailed study of the biography, written about the end of the fifth century, of a notable French saint. The study includes a comparison with Xenophon's *Cyrus* (*Anab. I. 9*), Nepos' *Epaminondas*, and Gregory of Nyssa's *Ephraem*. The biographer's dogmatic purpose is to show that Hilary's teaching is in harmony with Augustinian-Roman doctrine. Dr. Kolon argues very soundly that the biography is the work of one Reverentius, to whom it is attributed in the Arles MS., rather than the production of Honoratus of Marseilles, to whom Pseudo-Gennadius assigns it. If a couple of pages on the rare words used by Reverentius had been added, the value of this treatise would have been increased: the lexicographers appear never to have read it, as there is at least one unrecorded word (*tinniuolum*, c. 19, § 25).

A. SOUTER.

Ancient and Modern Rome. By SENATORE RODOLFO LANCIANI. Pp. x + 169. London, Calcutta, Sydney: George G. Harrap and Co., Ltd. 5s. net.

LANCIANI'S larger works were the delight of young scholars a generation ago. The present brochure has much of the old fascination about it, and is written in the wonderfully good English¹ that the veteran still has at his command. It is the fiftieth volume in the attractive series called *Our Debt to Greece and Rome*, and the space is in consequence somewhat restricted. No one could draw out better the comparison between the ancient and the modern city of Rome, and this is done in thirteen chapters, dealing with such matters as water-supply, hospitals, palaces, dwelling-houses, and libraries. Into these chapters much information is crowded, and the personal element is not obtruded, despite the immense services the author has rendered to the study of his subject. In another edition some signs of haste might be removed. On p. 7 the excellent water-supply of Madrid deserved recognition. On p. 21, for 'Celsus Aurelianus, an eminent physician of the beginning of the third century,' read 'Caelius Aurelianus . . . of the fourth century' (a misprint in the Greek on the same page). On p. 22, for 'Asklepia' read 'Asklepieia.' On p. 25, for the sake of the uninitiated, the volume of the *Corpus*, No. 6, should be specified. On p. 42, the word 'palaeography' is used in the sense of 'epigraphy.' On p. 105, 'Domitian' appears to be a slip for 'Augustus.' On p. 121, for 'Solis' read 'Sulis.' On p. 122, for 'Phlaegreans' read 'Phlegraeans.' On p. 129, for 'Lebadia' read 'Lebadea,' and for 'Aezanis' read 'Aezani.' On p. 137, substitute 'Victumulae' for the antiquated reading 'Victumviae' (Livy XXI. 57, 9). Certain trifling errors in English and misprints need not be specified.

A. SOUTER.

Select Treatises of S. Bernard of Clairvaux: De Diligendo Deo, edited by W. W. WILLIAMS; *De Gradibus Humilitatis et Superbiae*, edited by B. R. V. MILLS. One vol. Pp. xxiii + 169. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1926. 10s. net.

THIS is an admirable piece of work, and an excellent introduction to the works of one of the very greatest of the mediaeval writers. The editors have not been satisfied to print a current text, but have made extensive collations of manuscripts, and produced a practically faultless text. This they have also equipped with introductions, a critical apparatus, a learned and helpful commentary, and adequate indexes. Mr. Mills' record of scripture quotations is not quite so complete as that of Mr. Williams. On p. 17, l. 15, *percursum* is doubtless a misprint for *percussum*; the lexical notes might sometimes have been made fuller and more precise, if recent works on the later Latin had been more widely used; and a closer acquaintance with the works of Jerome and Augustine would have

provided some very apt illustrations; but who is sufficient for these things?

A. SOUTER.

The Eclogues of Antonio Geraldini. Edited with Introduction and Notes by WILFRED P. MUSTARD. Pp. 84. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1924. \$1.50.

THIS attractive volume has all the qualities we have learned to associate with Professor Mustard's works. Those who know his editions of *Baptista Mantuanus*, *Sannazaro*, and others, in a field that he has made all his own, will regard praise of his textual accuracy and his extensive knowledge of the ancient Latin poets as superfluous. The text is based on a copy of the earliest known edition, printed at Rome in 1485, but other early editions, all of which appear to be rare, have been consulted. The format is that of the earlier volumes of the series, but in this case a rich cream-coloured paper has been employed.

A. SOUTER.

Abhandlungen zur antiken Rechtsgeschichte. Festschrift für GUSTAV HANAUSEK. Graz: Ulr. Mosers Buchhandlung. Pp. vii + 159. 7 Sch. 15.

THIS volume, in honour of Gustav Hanausek, contains essays by six 'Freunden und Schülern.'

Professor Wenger sets out some broad conclusions, reached or confirmed in the course of his labours on his *Römisches Zivilprozessrecht*. After stating an interesting hypothesis on the origin of the *Legis Actio*, he calls attention to the fundamental difference between the classical *Ordo Iudiciorum*, a State-controlled arbitration, and the *Cognitio* of the later Empire, an administrative procedure, essentially a branch of Public Law. There has been a complete reversal of the old ideas: litigation, once a *Partei-Akt*, has become a State mechanism.

Professor San Nicolo, studying the changes of form of Babylonian and Assyrian private documents, shows the great antiquity of modern-looking commercial forms, and the conservatism which retains them, practically unaltered, through a period reckoned by millennia.

Professor Steinwenter continues his fruitful enquiries into the history of Byzantine procedure, and shows, *inter alia*, that the Libellary system, which we commonly associate with Justinian, was in use for certain cases, at least in Egypt, early in the fifth century.

Dr. Lautner discusses *Interrogationes in Iure*. He denies classicality to the name '*actiones interrogatoriae*,' and to the notions that the answer creates a quasi-contract, or a '*pro herede gestio*.' The purpose of '*interrogationes*' he finds, following Demelius, in characteristics of the group of actions to which they applied, and not in the desire to facilitate proof, which appears in the Digest as their purpose, after they have been generalised. He considers details in connexion with the '*interrogatio*': '*an vel qua ex parte heres sit*,' contending, with arguments of varying strength, for a large number of interpolations.

Professor Pfaff discusses the '*Vermögensbegriff*' in classical law. The texts have many

¹ Sometimes a little American

expressions more or less equivalent to 'Ver-mögen,' not all of precisely the same meaning: what he, in fact, discusses, is the 'Bonabegriff.' 'Non constat,' however, that 'bona' means in all relations the same thing, or that the classical jurists, casuists all, ever cumbered themselves with a 'Bonabegriff.' One needs more proof than the author gives that a classical lawyer ever thought of a debt as a negative asset. He attributes to the classics that abstract and generalising method more commonly thought Byzantine.

Professor Koschaker gives us an enlightening discussion of conditional Novatio. This leads to remarks on the relation between the 'exceptiones pacti' and 'doli,' which seem less acceptable. It is one thing to hold it Byzantine to give the 'exceptio pacti' the characteristics of a 'bonae fidei' transaction, another to hold that a classic could not have thought that to sue in defiance of a pact, relying on the civil law position, was 'dolus,' and thus have held 'exceptio doli' or 'exceptio pacti' available. G. 3. 179 is not lightly to be set aside as an interpolation.

W. W. BUCKLAND.

Fuldaer Studien (Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosphilol. und histor. Klasse, Jahrgang, 1925, 3. Abhandlung). Von P. LEHMANN. Pp. 53; one collotype plate. München, 1925.

IN 1672 Graevius, writing to Heinsius, described the Fulda Library as 'omnium praestantissima et antiquissima.' It is with this great centre of German culture that the present monograph, from the hand of a master, is concerned. It is to pave the way for Professor Lehmann's exhaustive treatise on Fulda. In order to form an idea of the place Fulda occupied in the literary life of mediaeval Germany, one must have recourse, in the first instance, to the extant Fulda manuscripts and ancient Fulda catalogues. Thus Professor Lehmann begins with a survey of the extant Fulda catalogues, and discusses their difficulties. He points out that the catalogue next in point of time after the one in the Bâle manuscript F III. 15A is the catalogue falsely attributed by Becker (*Catalogi antiqui*, No. 128) to the twelfth century; and dates it between 840 and 850. He convincingly proves that part of the latter catalogue is the fragment given by Becker as No. 13; and he has illuminating remarks to make on the new sixteenth-century catalogue discovered by Karl Christ, and on the Fulda index of theological books found in the Paris MS. *Novv. Acq. lat.* 643 (saec. xvii).

The Fulda library suffered enormous losses during the Reformation, when its books were neglected, misplaced, and stolen. Fulda books are now scattered among many libraries of Europe, and in order to reconstruct the ancient collection, it is of great importance to ascertain the characteristic marks of Fulda manuscripts. In the hands of an expert like Professor Lehmann, a single name, or the merest ungrammatical phrase jotted down on the cover, furnishes a key for solving historical and biblio-

graphical problems; and thus he vindicates a numbers of manuscripts for Fulda. In conclusion he goes into a long discussion of the Vienna manuscript of the *Lorsch Annals*, which was written at Fulda. He corrects old readings, offers new ones of historic interest, and altogether throws fresh light on a number of otherwise obscure or misunderstood points. No student of ancient manuscripts can afford to leave this suggestive monograph unread. It has a peculiar interest for Englishmen, since Fulda was an Anglo-Saxon foundation, where, in its early history, Anglo-Saxon culture predominated.

E. A. LOWE.

Palaeographia latina IV. (St. Andrew University Publications XXX.). Edited by Professor W. M. LINDSAY. Pp. 85; 6 collotype plates. Oxford University Press: Humphrey Milford, 1925. 5s.

THE issue before us opens with a short but illuminating article by Professor Heraeus, in which he discusses certain critical signs, and convincingly shows that the problem presented by *ia*, in the Laurentian manuscript of Livy (III. 26. 9; IV. 13. 6; X. 5. 13; X. 37. 15), which has baffled many editors, is solved by interpreting *ia* as *in alio* (sc. *codice* or *exemplari*). The expanded form actually occurs in the margin of the famous Fronto manuscript.¹

As a pendant to the paper on the early Lorsch scriptorium, which appeared in the previous number, Professors Lindsay and Lehmann give in the present issue a brief account of the abbreviations and other scribal usage prevailing in the ninth century in the neighbouring centre of the archbishopric of Mayence, Professor Lindsay discussing the half-dozen manuscripts in Rome (in the Palatine collection), and Professor Lehmann dealing with the fourteen manuscripts in Munich.

The *fidce de résistance* of this number is furnished by Dr. Tafel's study of the Lyons scriptorium, continued from the second issue. It contains a mass of valuable information on manuscripts connected with Florus, Manno, Leidrad, Agobard, Amolo, and Remigius; on extant ninth-century manuscripts from Lyons, on names found in these manuscripts, on current abbreviations, and on Spanish activity at Lyons. For the sifting and editing of this material we are indebted to Professor Lindsay, who concludes the paper with a sketch of the original plan, in Dr. Tafel's own words. To the list of manuscripts with annotations by Florus should be added Paris lat. 10592 (Cyprian) saec. V ex, and Paris N.A. lat. 1443 (S. Augustini Epistulae), saec. IX.

An article by A. de Boüard, on the origin of the Caroline minuscule—a question much disputed of late—closes this interesting issue. Six excellent plates illustrate the article on the Mayence scriptorium.

E. A. LOWE.

¹ On fol. 14 of Paris 5763 (Caesar, Bell. Gall.) saec. IX. an alternative colophon is introduced by *in alio ita* (see Steffens, *Lat. Pat.*³, pl. 51). On fol. 12 occurs the phrase *ita in alio habetur*.

Latin Lyrics with Measured Music. By W. MCARTHUR. London: Jonathan Cape, 1925. Pp. 46.

THIS little volume is an attempt to make the study of Latin poetry attractive to pupils by providing music to which it may be sung; and I wish it all success. Most boys and girls like music, and the singing of odes of Horace should be a popular exercise. My only difficulty is that no bar-lines or time-signatures are provided. Each line of verse is treated as a rhythmical unit; long notes correspond to long syllables, and short to short, but there is no further indication of how these longs and shorts are to be grouped. Yet some grouping will surely be found necessary in practice. Mr. McArthur's intention apparently is that this may be left to the singers or to the accompanist. I am told that these tunes were tried at the Edinburgh meeting of the Association for the Reform of Latin Teaching, and that they proved a success. The only other published collection of music for Latin lyrics that I know is Rudolf Zwintscher's *Die Oden des Horaz, mit genauer Uebertragung der alten*

Metren in musikalische Rhythmen (Leipzig, 1912). Here all the music is barred and provided with time-signatures, which in the case of Sapphics vary from bar to bar (duple time alternating with triple time); Alcaics are set in $\frac{3}{4}$ bars. The aim of the writer was to provide music which did fuller justice to the quantities of the Latin metres than the well-known music of Flemming for the ode *Integer vitae*, which was based mainly on the prevalent Latin accents, and therefore assumed the form of $\frac{4}{4}$ time.

Mr. McArthur's tunes for Horace are taken mainly from sixteenth-century French composers—Lejeune, Mauduit, Savorny—who seem to have aimed at introducing classical metres into French verse. But the music here provided includes settings by Martin Agricola for elegiacs and hendecasyllabic verse. In regard to the former I feel that the treatment of the pentameter as a rhythmical unit, without any break in the middle, is a defect which impairs its rhythmical effect. I should much prefer a rest of half a bar at the diaeresis.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

OXFORD PHILOLOGICAL SOCIETY.

THE following papers were read:

January 29, 'The Delphian Inscription alleged to be the Lex Gabinia,' by Mr. M. N. Tod.

February 5, 'Aeschylus' Eumenides,' by Professor G. G. A. Murray.

February 19, 'Thirty Years of Athenian Politics, 510-480 B.C.,' by Mr. H. T. Wade-Gery.

February 26, 'An Apology for the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius,' by Mr. M. M. Gillies.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK). (1926.)

ANTIQUITIES.—February 15. A. M. Brooks, *Architecture (in Our Debt to Greece and Rome)* [Boston: Marshall Jones, 1924] (T. F. Hamlin). Praised for its sketch of the development of European architecture, but criticised severely for over-emphasis of non-essential accidents, and for an over-simplification which leads to the enunciation of hard-and-fast rules.—March 29. Helen H. Tanzer, *The Villas of Pliny the Younger* [New York: Columbia University Press, 1924] (H. W. Magoun). A collection of plans drawn by various scholars. M. discusses at length the meanings of 'cavaedium' and 'atrium.'

HISTORY.—March 8. R. Carpenter, *The Greeks in Spain* (Bryn Mawr Notes and Monographs, No. 6) [London and New York: Longmans, 1925] (M. Rostovtzeff). Highly praised, especially for its estimate of the influence of the Phocæan culture on the native Iberian.—A. M. Shepard, *Sea Power in Ancient History* [Boston: Little and Brown, 1924] (J. W.

Pratt). A 'sane and moderate' attempt to apply the principles of Admiral Mahan.—March 15. E. G. Hardy, *The Catilinarian Conspiracy in its Context* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1924). E. G. Hardy, *Some Problems in Roman History* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924] (E. T. Sage). Favourable. S. criticises several points of detail.

LITERATURE.—January 18. G. Norwood, *The Art of Terence* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1923] (F. G. Ballentine). Favourable. B. criticises N.'s preference for the 'Hecyra' and depreciation of the 'Andria.'—Helen H. Law, *Studies in the Songs of Plautine Comedy* [Menasha, Wisconsin: Banta, 1922] (R. C. Flickinger). A doctoral dissertation. Praised. F. discusses Leo's and Fraenkel's theories of the sources of the Plautine 'cantica.'—January 25. Eleanor S. Duckett, *Catullus in English Poetry* (Smith College Classical Studies, No. 6) [Northampton, Mass.: 1925] (W. P. Mustard). M. approves, and adds parallels of his own.—March 8. K. P. Harrington, *Catullus and His Influence (in Our Debt to Greece and Rome)* [Boston: Marshall

Jones, 1923] (H. V. M. Dennis). Favourable on the whole.

RELIGION.—March 22. Jane E. Harrison, *Mythology (in Our Debt to Greece and Rome)* [Boston: Marshall Jones, 1924] (E. Riess). Long review, mainly unfavourable. 'It sets out as ascertained results what can be characterised only as a chain of brilliant hypotheses of doubtful correctness.'

[The issues of February 15 and March 1, 15 and 29 contain lists of classical articles in non-classical periodicals.]

MUSÉE BELGE, XXX., No. 1 (JANUARY, 1926).

A. Severyns, *La patrie de Penthésilée*. Homer's Priam fights against Pontic Amazons: to avoid contradiction and to meet Milesian disillusion on these, Arctinus made Penth. Thracian, and distinct traces of this tradition continue.—H. Bornecque, *Collation des MSS. des Amours d'Ovide conservés à la Bibliothèque Nationale*.—L. Laurand, *Le MS. Laurentianus L45 du De Amicitia de Cicéron*. Both collations made for new Budé editions.

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(NOVEMBER, 1925-JANUARY, 1926.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, *Hellenistische Dichtung in der Zeit des Kallimachos*. 2 Bde. [Berlin, 1924, Weidmann] (Bethe). A foundation-stone for the history of Hellenistic poetry. Though the hymns of Callimachus form its kernel, the work also includes Latin elegiac poetry.

LATIN LITERATURE.—H. Brinkmann, *Geschichte der lateinischen Liebesdichtung im Mittelalter* [Halle, 1925, Niemeyer. Pp. viii + 110] (Manitius). Most successful. We are now on firm ground in this important and interesting field.—H. V. Canter, *Rhetorical Elements in the Tragedies of Seneca* [University of Illinois, 1925. Pp. vi + 185] (Rossbach). Exact and thorough.—*Martialis Epigrammaton libri*. Edidit W. Heraeus [Leipzig, 1925, Teubner. Pp. lxxviii + 417] (Helm). Thoroughly scientific in method; at times reminiscent of Lachmann's *Lucretius*. Reviewer discusses and criticises textual details at some length.

HISTORY.—F. Münzer, *Die politische Vernichtung des Griechentums. Das Erbe der Alten, herausg. von O. Immisch*. [Leipzig, 1925. Pp. 69] (Beroc). Welcomed as a successful and sensible account of the Greek world from Alexander to 146 B.C.—W. Otto, *Kulturgeschichte des Altertums* [München, 1925, Beck. Pp. x + 175] (Hohl). Equally useful to classical philologists, archaeologists, and historians; does not attempt to be a systematic account or a complete bibliography, but is extraordinarily clear and to the point.—G. Weigand, *Ethnographie von Makedonien* [Leipzig, 1924, Brandstetter. Pp. viii + 104] (Mehlis). Essential for students of Macedonian history and lan-

guage.—A. E. R. Boak and J. E. Dunlap, *Two Studies in later Roman and Byzantine Administration (University of Michigan Studies)* [New York, 1924, The Macmillan Company. Pp. 324] (Hohl). The 'studies' deal with the 'magister officii' and the 'praepositus sacri cubiculi'; extraordinary industry shown in collecting the wide material and sound criticism in arranging and reviewing it.

PHILOSOPHY.—G. Burckhardt, *Heraklit. Seine Gestalt und sein Künden* [Zürich, n.d., Füssli. Pp. 86] (Nestle). An illuminating description of Heraclitus' personality and message.—K. Vorländer, *Die griechischen Denker vor Sokrates* [Leipzig, 1924, Bausteiner Verlag. Pp. 110] (Nestle). Scientific throughout, and reveals the expert in history of philosophy; happily free from the modern tendency to onesidedness.—*Aristoteles, über die Seele*. Ins Deutsche übertragen von A. Lasson [Jena, 1924, Diederichs. Pp. 82] (Gohlke). A readable translation, and worth reading.—G. Mehlis, *Plotin* [Stuttgart, 1924. Pp. 148] (Lehmann). Most warmly recommended as an introduction to Plotinus; disputed points left aside, but many interesting comparisons with other philosophers made.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—M. J. Rostowzew, *Skythien und Bosphorus. Kritische Übersicht der literarischen und archäologischen Denkmäler* [Akad. f. d. Geschichte d. materiell. Kultur, 1925. Pp. 627] (Bickermann). The vast material, mainly archaeological, has been carefully sifted and conveniently arranged; but Rostowzew's own standpoint is historical rather than archaeological. The MS. was ready in 1918, but conditions in Russia have delayed the printing for seven years.

MYTHOLOGY AND RELIGION.—A. Rutgers, *Propylaen. Inleiding tot de Mythologie van Hellas en Rome* [Zutphen, 1924, Thieme en Cie. Pp. iv + 252, and 81 illustrations] (Kraemer). Rutgers handles the vast material with great skill, and is everywhere familiar with the latest results of modern research.—*Fontes Historiae Religionis Aegyptiacae, Pars V*. Collegit Th. Hopfner [Bonn, 1925, Marcus u. Weber] (v. Bissing). The copious indices will be of great service not only to Egyptologists, but also to historians.

PALAEOGRAPHY.—G. Jachmann, *Die Geschichte des Terentextes im Altertum. Rektoratsprogramm für die Universität Basel 1923-24* [Basel, 1924. Pp. 152] (Klotz). Deals with two points of especial importance, the illustrations and the divisions into scenes; an appreciable advance in the question of the textual tradition of Terence.—V. Gardthausen, *Das alte Monogramm* [Leipzig, 1924, Hiersemann. Pp. xii + 188, and 5 plates] (Wessely). A brilliant piece of pioneer work, which opens up a large new field for palaeographical research.

GENERAL.—A. Gercke and E. Norden, *Einführung in die Altertumswissenschaft, Bd. I, 3. Aufl.* [Leipzig, 1923-24, Teubner] (Schroeder). The different sections are now published separately, and have in some cases been considerably enlarged.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

** * Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Baillie Reynolds** (P. K.) *The Vigiles of Imperial Rome*. Pp. 133; illustrations and plans. Oxford: University Press, 1926. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Batterbury** (T. K. E.) *Reddenda Minima. A Latin Translation Book for Beginners*. Pp. 100. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Cloth, 2s.
- Baynes** (N. H.) *The Byzantine Empire*. Pp. 256. (Home University Library.) London: Williams and Norgate, 1925. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Bell** (E.) *Prehellenic Architecture in the Aegean*. Pp. xvi+213; 80 illustrations, maps, and plans. (The Origins of Architecture, II.) London: G. Bell and Sons, 1926. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Bethe** (E.) *Griechische Dichtung*. Parts 1-6. Pp. 192; 4 plates, 158 illustrations. (Handbuch der Literaturwissenschaft.) Potsdam: Akademische Verlagsgesellschaft Athenaion, 1926.
- Bulletin de l'Association Guillaume Budé**. No. 10. Janvier, 1926.
- Busolt** (G.) *Griechische Staatskunde*. Dritte, neugestaltete Auflage der Gr. Staats- und Rechtsaltertümer. Erster Hauptteil. Pp. ix+642. Zweite Hälfte, bearbeitet von H. Swoboda. Pp. xi+958. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1920 and 1926. Cloth, 20 and 54 M.
- Carmody** (W. M.) *The Subjunctive in Tacitus*. Pp. x+185. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926. Cloth.
- Cary** (E.) *Dio's Roman History*. With an English translation. In nine volumes. VIII. Pp. v+482. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1925. Cloth, 10s. net (leather 12s. 6d. net).
- Classical Philology**. Vol. XXI., No. 1. January, 1926.
- Cook Wilson** (J.) *Statement and Inference*. With other philosophical papers. Edited from the MSS., etc., by A. S. L. Farquharson, with a portrait, memoir, and selected correspondence. In two volumes. Pp. clxx+901. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Cloth, 31s. 6d. net.
- Diehl** (E.) *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres*. Vol. II., fasc. 2. Pp. 81-160. Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. Paper, 3.75 M.
- Drew** (D. L.) *Culex. Sources and their bearing on the problem of authorship*. Pp. 107. Oxford: Blackwell, 1925. Cloth.
- FitzGerald** (A.) *The Letters of Synesius of Cyrene, translated into English with introduction and notes*. Pp. 272. London: Milford, 1926. Cloth and boards, 21s. net.
- Fowler** (H. N.) *Plato*. With an English translation. VI. *Cratylus, Parmenides, Greater Hippias, Lesser Hippias*. Pp. vii+480. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1926. Cloth, 10s. net (leather, 12s. 6d. net).
- Frangoudis** (G. S.) *L'Hellénisme en lutte contre l'Orient et l'Occident. Les Traités de Sèvres et de Lausanne. Appel aux nations libérales*. Pp. 292. Athens: Imprimerie Franco-hellénique, 1925. Paper.
- Gardner** (P.) *New Chapters in Greek Art*. Pp. xv+367; xvi plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Glots** (G.) *Ancient Greece at Work. An economic history of Greece from the Homeric period to the Roman conquest*. Pp. xii+402; 49 illustrations. (The History of Civilisation.) London: Kegan Paul (New York: Knopf), 1926. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Glots** (G.) *Histoire Générale. Histoire Ancienne, deuxième Partie. Histoire Grecque*. Tome premier: *Des Origines aux Guerres Médiques*. Pp. xix+635. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires de France, 1925. Paper, 40 fr.
- Goelzer** (H.) et **Bellessort** (A.) *Virgile, Enéide, Livres I-VI. Texte établi par H. G. et traduit par A. B.* (Collection des Universités de France.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres.' Paper, 18 fr.
- Goldmann** (E.) *Die Duenos-Inschrift*. Pp. xiii+176, 2 plates. Heidelberg: Winter, 1926. Paper, 10 M.; bound, 12 M.
- Green** (C. A. F.) *Test Examinations in Latin*. Pp. 56. London: Methuen, 1926. 1s. 3d.
- Grundy** (G. B.) *A History of the Greek and Roman World*. Pp. vii+536, 2 maps. London: Methuen, 1926. Cloth, 22s. 6d. net.
- Gudeman** (A.) *Geschichte der Lateinischen Literatur*. I. Von den Anfängen bis zum Ende der Republik. Pp. 120. II. Die Kaiserzeit bis Hadrian. Pp. 148. III. Von Hadrian bis zum Ende des 6. Jahrh. Pp. 132. *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Lateinischen Literatur vom 2.-6. Jahrhundert*. Pp. 120. (Sammlung Göschen 52, 866, 890, 898.) Berlin and Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1923-25. Cloth.
- Gummere** (R. M.) *Seneca. Ad Lucilium epistulae morales*. With an English translation. In three volumes. III. Pp. vi+463. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1925. Cloth, 10s. net (leather 12s. 6d. net).
- Gwynn** (A.) *Roman Education from Cicero to Quintilian*. Pp. 260. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Hammer** (J.) *Prolegomena to an edition of the Panegyricus Messalae. The military and political career of M. Valerius Messala Corvinus*. Pp. ix+100. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1925. Paper, 6s. 6d. net.
- Harder** (R.) *'Ocellus Lucanus'*. Pp. xxv+161. (Neue Philologische Untersuchungen, I.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. Paper, 9 M.
- Harrington** (K. P.) *Mediaeval Latin, selected and edited by K. P. H.* Pp. xxix+698, with

- illustrations. New York, etc.: Allyn and Bacon. Cloth.
- Harvard Studies in Classical Philology.* Vol. XXXVI. Pp. 186. Cambridge (U.S.A.): Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1925. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Hicks* (R. D.) *Diogenes Laertius.* With an English translation. In two volumes. Pp. li + 549; vi + 704. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1925. Cloth, 10s. net (leather, 12s. 6d. net) each.
- Hofmann* (J. B.) *Lateinische Umgangssprache.* Pp. xvi + 184. (Indogermanische Bibliothek. Erste Abteilung: Grammatiken, 17.) Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1926. Paper, 5 M. (bound, 6.50 M.).
- Holst* (H.) *Die Wortspiele in Ciceros Reden.* Pp. 119. (Symbolae Osloenses, Fasc. supplement. I.) Oslo: Some and Co., 1925. Paper.
- Hommel* (F.) *Ethnologie und Geographie des alten Orients.* Pp. xii + 1108. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, III., 1, 1.) Munich: Beck, 1926. Cloth, 48 M.
- Housman* (A. E.) *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Ciuilis libri decem. Editorum in usum edidit A. E. H.* Pp. xxxvi + 342. Oxford: Blackwell, 1926. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- How* (W. W.) *Cicero, Select Letters.* With historical introductions, notes, and appendices. A new edition based upon that of Watson, revised and annotated by W. W. H., with a critical introduction by A. C. Clark. Vol. I., Text, not paged, 1925. 6s. net. Vol. II., Notes. Pp. vii + 579. 1926. 12s. 6d. net. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Jacoby* (C.) *Dionysi Halicarnasensis Antiquitates Romanae. Supplementum, indices.* Pp. iv + 69. Leipzig: Teubner, 1925. Bound, 3 G.M.
- Jax* (K.) und *Kalinka* (E.) *Kurzgefasste lateinische Sprachlehre.* Pp. 121. Lateinisches Übungsbuch. Pp. 143. Vienna: Oesterreichischer Bundesverlag, 1925. Boards, 1.50 and 1.70 R.M.
- Knoche* (U.) *Die Ueberlieferung Juvenals.* Pp. 75. (Klassisch-Philologische Studien, Heft 6.) Berlin: Ebering, 1926. Paper.
- Kromayer-Veith.* *Schlachten-Atlas zur Antiken Kriegsgeschichte. Vierte Lieferung, griechische Abteilung, I.: von Marathon bis Chaeroneia.* 120 Karten auf 34 Tafeln. Leipzig: Wagner u. Debes. 1926.
- Lamb* (W. R. M.) *Plato.* With an English translation. V.: *Lysis, Symposium, Gorgias.* Pp. xx + 536. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1925. Cloth, 10s. net (leather, 12s. 6d. net).
- Legrand* (Ph. E.) *Bucoliques grecs. Tome I.: Théocrite. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection des Universités de France.)* Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1925. Paper, 25 frs.
- Lévi* (S.) *Eastern Humanism.* Pp. 9. (Dacca University Bulletins, No. 4.) London, etc.: Oxford University Press, 1925. Paper, 8d. net.
- Mackail* (J. W.) *James Leigh Strachan-Davidson, Master of Balliol. A Memoir.* Pp. 124. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Macnaghten* (H.) *The Odes of Horace done into English Verse.* Pp. x + 279. Cambridge: University Press, 1926. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Macurdy* (G. H.) *Troy and Paeonia, with Glimpes of Ancient Balkan History and Religion.* Pp. 259. New York: Columbia University Press (London: Milford), 1925. Cloth and boards, 20s. net.
- Marris* (W.) *The Odyssey of Homer, translated by Sir W. M.* Pp. xii + 438. London, etc.: Oxford University Press, 1925. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Meddelelser fra Norsk Forening for Sprogvidenskap.* Bind I., Hefte 1. Pp. 43. Oslo: Aschehoug, 1925. Paper.
- Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome.* Vol. V. Pp. 130; 66 plates. Rome: American Academy, 1925. Paper.
- Moore* (C. H.) *Tacitus: The Histories.* With an English translation. In 2 volumes. I.: Books I.-III. Pp. xviii + 479. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1925. Cloth, 10s. net (leather, 12s. 6d. net).
- Nairn* (J. A.) *Buffon: Discours sur le Style. Texte français avec version latine.* Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1926. Paper, 4 frs.
- Nilsson* (M. P.) *Imperial Rome. I.: Men and Events. II.: The Empire and its Inhabitants.* Translated from the Swedish of M. P. N. by G. C. Richards. Pp. xvi + 376; 24 illustrations and a map. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1926. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Nixon* (P.) *Plautus.* With an English translation. Vol. III. Pp. 523. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1924. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Parry* (R. St. J.) *Henry Jackson, O.M., Vice-Master of Trinity College and Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge. A Memoir.* Pp. vii + 299; portrait. Cambridge: University Press, 1926. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Perrett* (W.) *Some Questions of Musical Theory. Chapter I.: How Olympos found his New Scale. Chapter II.: The Olympon.* Pp. viii + 30. Cambridge: Heffer, 1926. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Phillimore* (J. S.) *The Hundred Best Latin Hymns, selected by J. S. P.* Pp. xxiii + 174. Glasgow: Gowans and Gray, 1926. Paper, 1s. net; cloth, 2s. net; leather, 3s. 6d. net.
- Rand* (E. K.) *Ovid and his Influence.* Pp. xii + 184. (Our Debt to Greece and Rome.) London: Harrap. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Reinhardt* (K.) *Kosmos und Sympathie: Neue Untersuchungen über Poseidonios.* Pp. 420. Munich: Beck, 1926. Cloth, 20 M.
- Richter* (G. A. M.) *Ancient Furniture: A History of Greek, Etruscan, and Roman Furniture.* With an Appendix by A. W. Barker. Pp. xxxviii + 191; 364 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Cloth, 10js. net.
- Robin* (L.) *Platon: Oeuvres complètes. Tome IV., 1^{re} partie: Phédon. Texte établi et traduit.* Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1926. Paper, 20 frs.

- Salonius* (A. H.) *Martyrium Beati Petri Apostoli a Lino Episcopo Conscriptum*. Pp. 58. (Societas Scientiarum Fennica: Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum I. 6.) Helsingfors, 1926. Paper.
- Salt* (H. S.) *The Story of Dido and Aeneas. The Fourth Book of Virgil's 'Aeneid' translated into English verse*. Pp. 47. London: Watts and Co., 1926. Paper, 1s. net.
- Schadewaldt* (W.) *Monolog und Selbstgespräch*. Pp. 270. (Neue Philologische Untersuchungen, 2. Heft.) Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. Paper, 14 M.
- Schisas* (P. M.) *Offences against the State in Roman Law*. With a Preface by S. H. Leonard. Pp. xx+248. London: University of London Press, 1926. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Schulten* (A.) *Sertorius*. Pp. 168; maps, etc. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1926. Stiff paper, 14 M. (bound, 16 M.).
- Slaughter* (M. S.) *Roman Portraits: Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, Cicero, Augustus*. With a remembrance by A. F. West. Pp. vi+128. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Milford), 1925. Cloth, \$1.50 (7s. net).
- Smyth* (H. W.) *Aeschylus*. With an English translation. In 2 volumes. II.: *Agamemnon, Libation-bearers, Eumenides, Fragments*. Pp. viii+528. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann (New York: Putnam), 1926. Cloth, 10s. net (leather, 12s. 6d. net).
- Spyridon and Eustratiades* (S.) *Catalogue of the Greek Manuscripts of the Library of the Laura on Mount Athos, with notices from other libraries*. Pp. iv+515. (Harvard Theological Studies. XII.) Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1925. Cloth and boards, 105s. net.
- Steele* (R.) *Opera hactenus inedita Rogeri Baconi*. Fasc. VI.: *Compotus Fratris Rogeri. Accedunt Compotus Roberti Grossecapitis Lincolniensis Episcopi, Massa Compoti Alexandri de Villa Dei*. Pp. xxv+302. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926. Stiff paper, 25s. net.
- Stella* (S.) *I nuovi frammenti di Saffo. Versioni ritmiche seguite da tre note critiche*. Pp. 33. Catania: C. Galàtola, 1926. Paper.
- Stewart* (H. F.) *Yale Jenkinson, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and University Librarian. A Memoir*. Pp. 152; portraits and facsimiles. Cambridge: University Press, 1926. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Stolz-Schmals*. *Lateinische Grammatik*. In 5. Aufl. völlig neu bearbeitet von M. Leumann u. J. B. Hofmann. 1. Lieferung: *Einführung*. Laut- und Formenlehre. Pp. x+344. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, II. ii. 3.) Munich: Beck, 1926. Paper.
- Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*. Vol. II. Pp. 81-172. Leyden: Sijthoff, 1925. Paper, price (of the volume) 6 fl.
- Terwien* (St. W. J.) *Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian. Ein Beitrag zum Studium der christlichen Sondersprache*. Pp. xvi+147. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums, XIV. Band, 1. Heft.) Paderborn: Schöningh, 1926. Paper, 8 M.
- The Journal of Roman Studies*. Vol. XV. Part I, 1925.
- The Subject Index of Periodicals*, 1922. Issued by the Library Association. I.: *Language and Literature*. Part I.: *Classical, Primitive, and Oriental*. Pp. 26. 4to. London: Grafton and Co., 1925. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Thörnell* (G.) *Studia Tertullianea*. IV.: *De Tertulliani Apologetico bis edito*. Pp. 154. (Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift, 1926; Filosophi, Språkvetenskap och Historiska Vetenskaper, 31.) Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1926. Paper, 5 kr.
- Walker* (R. J.) *Parnassus Biceps: Being a Treatment and Discussion of the Piraeen Marble*. Pp. xviii+310. Paris: G. Ficker, 1926. Paper.
- Walters* (H. B.) *Catalogue of the Engraved Gems and Cameos Greek Etruscan and Roman in the British Museum*. Revised and enlarged edition. Pp. lxiv+419; 44 plates. London, 1926. Sold at the Museum and elsewhere. Cloth.
- Way* (A. S.) *Greek through English*. Pp. xv+144. London and Toronto: Dent, 1926. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Wheeler* (R. E. M.) *Prehistoric and Roman Wales*. Pp. 299; 113 illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf* (U. von). *Euripides Ion*. Pp. iv+163. Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. Paper, 5.70 M. (bound, 7.50 M.).
- Wolff* (E.) *P. Cornelii Taciti Historiarum libri qui supersunt*. Erklärt von E. W. Zweiter Band. Buch III., IV., und V. Zweite Auflage, besorgt von G. Andresen. Pp. ix+304. Berlin: Weidmann, 1926. Paper, 7.50 M.
- Wright* (F. A.) *Catullus. The complete poems translated and edited, with an introduction*. Pp. viii+250. (Broadway Translations.) London: Routledge (New York: Dutton), 1926. Half vellum, 7s. 6d. net.
- Zielinski* (Th.) *La Religion de la Grèce Antique*. Traduction d' A. Fichelle. Pp. viii+191. (Collection d'Études Anciennes.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres,' 1926. Paper, 10 frs.

t, II.

Vol.
1925.

ungs-
zum
. Pp.
Kultur
ader-

XV.

ssued
guage
Primi-
ndon :
met.
: De
. 154.
Filo-
etens-
istska

ing a
raean
icker,

graved
n and
ed and
plates.
n and

Pp.
1926.

Roman
xford :
et.
ripides
, 1926.

riarum
E. W.
nd V.
dresen.
1926.

complete
intro-
Trans-
York :
et.

Grèce
. Pp.
ennes.)
Paper.